

1980

Perceived quality of life a comparison of tenants in public housing with tenants in rent supplement program.

Joseph Patrick. Donahoe
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Donahoe, Joseph Patrick., "Perceived quality of life a comparison of tenants in public housing with tenants in rent supplement program." (1980). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3032.

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.



NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

PERCEIVED QUALITY OF LIFE:
A COMPARISON OF TENANTS IN PUBLIC HOUSING
WITH TENANTS IN A RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

by

Joseph Patrick Donahoe

A Thesis
submitted to the Graduate School of Social Work
of The University of Windsor
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a
Master of Social Work Degree

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

May 1980

© J. Patrick Donahoe.

1980

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Dr. John Barnes, Chairman

Professor Harry Morrow, Member

Dr. Gerard McPhail, Member

ABSTRACT

PERCEIVED QUALITY OF LIFE:

A COMPARISON OF TENANTS IN PUBLIC HOUSING WITH TENANTS IN A RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

by

Joseph Patrick Donahoe

A comparative study was made of tenants in Public Housing with tenants in a Rent Supplement program regarding the variables: quality of life, stigma, alienation, physical health, community participation, sociability, socio-economic status of friends and psychological well-being.

The data was collected by means of structured interviews by social workers in the homes of Public Housing and Rent Supplement tenants in Windsor, Ontario. A total of 46 interviews were completed in July 1979; 22 interviews were with tenants in Public Housing and 24 were with tenants in a Rent Supplement program.

Rent Supplement tenants reported a higher degree of satisfaction with their program than did tenants in Public Housing. The Rent Supplement tenants had more contact with higher status friends than did Public Housing tenants. The Public Housing group reported higher rates of stigma

directed towards their children than did the Rent Supplement group. However, children in Public Housing projects took part in more community activities than did children in the Rent Supplement program. The reported differences between groups on these variables were statistically significant.

Although there was no statistically significant difference between the groups on the variable "total alienation," never-the-less, the Rent Supplement group reported a statistically significant higher rate of powerlessness while the Public Housing group reported a statistically significant higher rate of estrangement from work. Also, although there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in overall psychological well-being, never-the-less, the Rent Supplement group reported themselves to be more free and less tied down than did Public Housing tenants, while Public Housing tenants reported their lives more rewarding. There was a statistically significant difference between the groups in these two variables.

No statistically significant difference was found between the Public Housing group and the Rent Supplement group in quality of life, physical health and community participation by adults.

DEDICATION

To my wife Diane for her help and
assistance and for her love, gentleness and
special sharing that made a dream come true.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank his committee chairman Dr. John Barnes and committee members Professor Harry Morrow and Dr. Gerard McPhail for their encouragement and assistance during the development and writing of this thesis.

A special thanks is offered to Heather Bullock and Ron Dowhaniuk for their assistance in the collection of data and to Anne Kernick for her dedicated help while the manuscript was being prepared. Thanks is expressed also to Penny Alliet for her assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	v
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
PREFACE.	xii
CHAPTER	
I. A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF HOUSING PROBLEMS.	1
II. PUBLIC HOUSING IN THE UNITED STATES	16
III. PUBLIC HOUSING IN CANADA.	19
IV. PUBLIC HOUSING: PROS AND CONS	26
V. RENT SUPPLEMENT: AN ALTERNATIVE TO PUBLIC HOUSING?	36
VI. A SUMMARY	41
VII. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	44
VIII. SAMPLE SELECTION.	78
IX. HYPOTHESES.	86
X. FINDINGS.	89
PART I: Tenants in Rent Supplement and Public Housing Compared	
XI. FINDINGS.	105
PART II: Correlations Between Variables	
XII. CONCLUSIONS	111
XIII. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	115
APPENDIX A.	122

APPENDIX B.	137
APPENDIX C.	139
BIBLIOGRAPHY	143
VITA AUCTORIS.	150

LIST OF TABLES

1. Subjects Selected From Each Public Housing Project	80
2. Sub-Group I--Family	82
3. Sub-Group II--Seniors	84
4. Socioeconomic Status of Tenants' Friends	90
5. Accommodations of Tenants' Friends	91
6. Alienation	94
7. Religious Fulfillment for Senior Citizens	101
8. The Higher Mean Score for Each Variable	103
9- 19. Pearsons' Correlations	107

PREFACE

It is the purpose of this study to test empirically the contention that the Rent Supplement program, as compared to the Public Housing program, offers a higher quality of life to tenants, higher satisfaction and well-being and lower stigma and alienation.

The historical antecedents of present housing problems and programs developed to solve them will be examined. Following this, the literature will be reviewed to examine research on stigma, alienation, well-being and quality of life of tenants in Public Housing and Rent Supplement programs. Finally, the results of this present study will be presented, based on data obtained from tenants in a Public Housing and a Rent Supplement program in Windsor, Ontario.

CHAPTER I

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF HOUSING PROBLEMS

Modern problems in housing have as their origin, conditions which became apparent at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was then, for the first time, that modern industrial society became aware that adequate housing was beyond the reach of the working classes and the poor. It was only then, and ever so slowly, that a beginning was made to develop methods for providing adequate shelter for all, but in particular, for the lowest income groups in society. Many of the problems remain unsolved to this day.

Britain, the first country to industrialize, was the first to confront the inherent problems of modern society including the problems of housing. The growth of industries attracted an ever increasing flood of workers to the cities, seeking work in the factories. This inflow of population together with natural growth of the population far outstripped the capacity of the city to provide suitable accommodations. The result was severe overcrowding. This, combined with a total lack of sanitation and ignorance of even elemental practices of cleanliness and health, gave rise to conditions of filth and squalor that defy the

2
imagination.

London grew in the eight decades between 1801 and 1881 from less than one million to about two and a quarter million. In each of these decades the population of London increased by seventeen percent.¹ The overcrowding and its inherent conditions also increased. Yet, these conditions were not widely known and recognized. Hence, very little was done to improve them. Wohl notes:

Thus, in the first half of the nineteenth century-- there was no clear analysis of the housing conditions of the working classes for there was no precise and well-defined appreciation of housing as a social issue with deep underlying economic implications.²

A fear of cholera initiated the first efforts at reform.

Edwin Chadwick, one of the early reformers in the area of public health, drafted in 1842, "A Report on Sanitary Conditions of the Labouring Population of Great Britain." This report of conditions widely shocked the public and was the beginning of public awareness of living conditions of the poor.

A Royal Commission on the sanitary state of large towns, much influenced by Chadwick in 1844, documented the conditions of overcrowding. It recommended a central inspector of housing, and police inspection of common lodging

¹Anthony S. Wohl, The Eternal Slum (London: Edward Arnold (1977), p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 10.

houses where many of the new arrivals in cities lived. These lodging houses provided some of the worst incidents of squalor and depravity. An outbreak of cholera in 1847 on the continent led the government to appoint Chadwick to study sanitary problems in London. He found that thousands of houses in London were completely without plumbing.

By 1844, a pressure group called Health of Towns Association was formed to bring pressure to bear on the government for reform and to educate the public to the methods of public health and preventative medicine.

Under threat of cholera, the Public Health Act was passed in 1848. It created a central Board of Health.

The novels of Charles Dickens also did much to acquaint the public with living conditions of the poor. Much of the early reform then, was motivated by fear of disease and its spread to the wider community. The movement for improved sanitation, incorporating the methods of preventative medicine and public health, was the major focus for reform. Housing was only an issue of reform, indirectly. In time, however, the concern for public health led to reforms in housing.

Shaftesbury Acts

A major legislative accomplishment of the period was the passage by Parliament in 1851 of two reform acts sponsored by Lord Shaftesbury, the eminent social reformer of the nineteenth century. These acts, known as the

Shaftesbury Acts, have had a far reaching influence on the history of housing. The first act, the Common Lodging-Houses Act, called for government regulation of lodging houses and was the beginning of a trend against the laissez faire economic policies which so greatly hampered housing reform of the slum. The Act called for registration and regular inspection by the police of common lodging houses, which were dwellings of the poor, newly arrived in the city.

But, by far the most remarkable was the second of the Shaftesbury Acts, the Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Act. The Act, far in advance of its time, introduced the idea of public housing in 1851.³ It empowered local government to build their own model lodging houses and to pay for them out of public revenue. For various reasons, one of the main ones being weaknesses of the legislation, the Act did not reach, at the time, its great potential for social benefit. It became, in effect, a dead letter. However, the idea of direct government intervention in the housing market was now recognized in law. The Act was to play a more active role in the evolution of public housing at a more receptive future time.

The period from 1850 until the end of the nineteenth century marks the major period of housing reform in Britain. A number of serious obstacles were confronted. An apathetic

³The British equivalent of public housing is called Council Housing.

public was presented with detailed information about housing conditions and was convinced that the total community was affected by inadequate slum housing, not just the poor. The reformers were able to overcome the excesses of a laissez faire economic system. During the period the housing of the working classes and the poor finally became a social and political issue.

In the 1880's, with the demolition of slum areas for street construction and for the building of railways, London first faced the problem--how to destroy blight areas without aggravating conditions in adjoining districts. It was the street improvement projects with their callous eviction of poor tenants into the streets which did much to acquaint the public with the slum and the problems of the slum dweller. This injustice was constantly reported and criticized by the press. Activities of the railways in demolishing the homes of the poor without any efforts to rehouse the evicted were also widely reported and criticized in the press. Though their activities were forbidden by law, they continued unabated until the end of the century.

In 1883 a journalist, George Sims, began a series of articles in the press regarding the appalling conditions of the poor of London. His articles supported by the graphic illustrations of Frederick Bernard did much to arouse both public indignation and public demand for reform. But, it was an obscure pamphlet written by a little known London

clergyman that was to be the most influential instrument of the period for reform. Andrew Mearns' The Bitter Cry of Outcast London, a twenty page pamphlet, combined religious zeal and moral indignation and documented facts to describe the squalid conditions in which most of the poor lived.

Wohl comments that,

Mearns combined the sharp eye of the journalist or medical inspector with the moral fervour of the evangelical missionary, and in his fierce indignation, logic, integrity and evocative descriptions, he was rivalled only by the annual reports of some of the local medical officers of health.⁴

The impact of the pamphlet was astounding. As a result of it, housing reform took a new direction. The editor of the Pall Mall Gazette used Mearns' work as the basis of a powerful campaign for housing reform. These efforts did much to develop the social ground swell which led to so much public and government support for reform in housing. The Bitter Cry and its attendant appeal for better living conditions for the poor had a deep impact on the Settlement House Movement which, at the time, was in the early stage of its development and which was to have such profound effect on the housing reform movement in both Britain and North America.

As a result of the social impact made by The Bitter Cry of Outcast London, a Royal Commission on Housing of the Working Classes was established in 1884 and included among

⁴Anthony S. Wohl, The Eternal Slum, p. 210.


its members, Queen Victoria's son, the Prince of Wales.

The commission did an extensive study and included a wide range of opinion from the most informed thinkers of the age including such reformers as Lord Shaftesbury and Octavia Hill, both of whom were interviewed by the commission.

In its report in 1885, it stressed the major housing problem as crowding, not sanitation. It also stressed economic factors such as the ratio of rents to wages. It called for stricter enforcement of building codes. Another important recommendation was that Shaftesbury's moribund Lodging Houses Act of 1851 be revised to place power in the hands of the central municipal government. This recommendation was implemented in the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1885. It sanctioned the building and ownership of houses by local government. Public Housing or Council Housing, as it came to be called in Britain, was thus reintroduced and strengthened by this and other consolidating legislation in 1890.

By the beginning of World War I, council flats (public housing) had become widely established in Britain. Council flats had been built as early as 1869 by a special act in Liverpool and in the 1880's in Glasgow. By 1914, Glasgow and Liverpool alone had built a total of nearly 5,000 dwellings.⁵ A public housing program was well established in Britain at the beginning of the twentieth century.

⁵Ibid., p. 282.



Housing Reform in the United States

New York was the first American city to experience acutely, the problem of the slum and to attempt to evolve solutions to the appalling living conditions of the tenements. It was the port of entry of the flood of immigrants who began arriving in the United States from Europe in the early part of the nineteenth century. Immigration gained a renewed momentum in the 1890's. This influx of immigrants seeking a new and better life in America placed a serious stress on the means of providing housing. Houses designed to accommodate one family were soon used to accommodate up to four or more families. In dealing with these problems, New York developed experience and leadership that put it at the forefront of housing reform in North America in the nineteenth century.

In 1883, when the first tenement house was built, New York had a population of 250,000. Sixty-five years later, the population was 3,500,000, two-thirds of whom dwelt in 82,000 tenements. Overcrowding conditions were unmatched in any other city in the world. The Tenement House Committee of the New York State Legislature in 1894 noted that one ward of New York City had a density of 986.4 persons to every one of its 32 acres. Only one other city in the world approached this density, that being Bombay,

India, with 759.6 persons per acre of 46 acres in 1881.⁶

Housing reform in New York was motivated by a fear of the cholera which was rampant in the 1830's and 1840's, particularly in the tenement slums. In 1842, the city inspector, John H. Griscom, M.D., drew the attention of city aldermen to the health hazards caused by unsanitary conditions and serious overcrowding in the city.

Three years later, the New York Association for Improving Conditions of the Poor (A.I.C.P.) was formed. It was largely responsible for spear-heading reform through the reporting of actual living conditions among the poor, through legislation and through support of model tenements.

This association was concerned with overcrowding and it considered the slum a threat to the entire community. However, it tended to support the view that the chief source of poverty was defective character. It did little to develop restrictions against land speculators or slum landlords. Only with great reluctance was the A.I.C.P. to learn that the laws of supply and demand in a laissez faire economy could not provide adequate housing for low income workers. It continued to pursue and encourage the model tenement which it described as,

⁶ John G. Hill, "Fifty Years of Social Action on the Housing Front," Social Service Review (June 1948), pp. 160-176.

a tenement built by the individual capitalist or company with voluntary limited profits in favour of higher structural and sanitary qualities rather than those found in ordinary speculative tenements.

The A.I.C.P. organized a subsidiary company in 1854 to develop and manage a model tenement. The venture was not a success. The tenement degenerated into one of the worst slum pockets in the city and was sold in 1867.

Also important were the efforts of a group of physician reformers who pioneered the public health movement through their Council of Hygiene. As a result of their efforts, a metropolitan Board of Health of New York was established. As in Britain, housing reform in its early development in America was closely associated with the movement for preventative medicine and public health.

A committee appointed to study tenements by the New York State Legislature, chaired by Richard Watson Gilder, was the most thorough study of housing conditions up to that time. It focused on the high rate of disease and death in the tenements, the overcrowding and the absence of parks and playgrounds in tenement neighbourhoods. The report made housing a first page news item in many newspapers and did much to educate the public on housing problems of the poor. The committee discovered, with shock, that only 306 of the 255,033 persons in its study had access to a bathtub.

Influenced by the Cross Act (1875-1882) and the Torrens Act (1868-1882) in Great Britain which authorized the local municipalities to demolish buildings that were

deemed hazards to health, the committee recommended that similar power be given to the Board of Health. This recommendation was adopted by the state legislature and slum clearance projects began in 1896. The commission, due to its strong support of free enterprise, was not in favour of the public housing program of the Shaftesbury Act which had been consolidated in the Housing of the Working Classes Acts of 1885-1890. As a result, public housing was not considered as a solution to the housing problem of New York at that time. The commission was convinced that model tenements could provide adequate housing for low income families.

The model tenement had its roots in the model dwelling movement which developed in Britain in the early to mid 1800's. The movement encouraged wealthy individuals to provide model dwellings for poor families at rents they could afford. The reduction in rents was achieved by limiting the profits received by the landlord to five percent. The term "philanthropy at five percent" was often applied to these plans. Though the movement in Britain had begun to lose its momentum by the late 1870's, the idea of "philanthropy at five percent" persisted in several forms.⁷

An important reformer in Britain dedicated to the principle that private enterprise without government interference could solve the problem of providing adequate

⁷Anthony S. Wohl, The Eternal Slum, Chapter 6.

dwelling for low income families was Octavia Hill.⁸ She purchased her first model dwelling in 1865. Her management expanded to provide dwellings for about four thousand people by the 1880's. Her model houses were able to reach lower income groups more than most other model dwelling companies of that time.

She devoted much of her time to the training of "friendly rent collectors" who, like the friendly visitors of the charity organization, were encouraged to take a personal interest in the tenant families and their problems. Many of those trained by Octavia Hill pursued careers as Housing Managers.

The Octavia Hill system was adopted to a limited extent in the United States in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The system in America, however, excluded many of the problem families of low income for whom the system was supposedly intended.

The process of informing the public in the United States of the living conditions of the poor was slow to develop. The work in America that paralleled the impact of The Bitter Cry of Outcast London and the writings of Sims was a book by Jacob A. Riis published in 1879 called, How the Other Half Lives.

Riis had himself lived in the slums of New York when he had arrived as an immigrant to the United States from

⁸Ibid., Chapter 7.

his native Denmark. He was further exposed to their dehumanizing effects as a police reporter for a New York newspaper. His efforts on behalf of the poor slum dweller made him one of the most effective social reformers in the United States.

In 1898, a special committee was formed by the Charity Organization Society called the Tenement House Committee which was to have a profound influence on housing reform in the United States. Its members included Robert DeForest, president of the C.O.S. and Lawrence Veiller, a former settlement house worker and life long student of housing and housing reform, as secretary.

The metropolitan area of New York had consolidated in 1897 enabling a more coordinated effort towards area problems. The new city government appointed a commission to study and propose a new building code. The commission was open to suggestions from interested groups, an opportunity which was welcomed by the new committee of the C.O.S.

The committee worked for five months drafting proposals, but the work of the committee was in vain; not one of its proposals was included in the new code adopted by the municipal council of New York in 1899. The committee immediately launched a massive campaign to inform the public of the deplorable living conditions of the slums and to muster wide public support for reform.

A member of the C.O.S. Tenement House Committee, Lawrence Veiller, was one of the most effective of the

housing reformers. One of his greatest accomplishments was the elimination of the unhealthy "Dumbell Tenement" which was common in New York and which provided some of the most degrading living conditions in New York. Veiller did much to develop and enforce legislation that provided for close adherence by builders and landlords to building codes and safety measures. It was in this area that he made his greatest contribution as a reformer for better housing. He was also instrumental in establishing the National Housing Association in the United States which was able to unify the efforts for better housing across the nation.

The reform efforts of progressives such as Lawrence Veiller made substantial improvements in housing conditions by means of restrictive legislation, building codes and strict enforcement. But progress was slow. By 1928 about half of the "old law tenements" were still in existence and were housing about half a million families. Restrictive legislation did not address the problems of supply. It did not produce new housing units for the needs of low income families. By the early 1930's these families were being recognized by reformers in the housing area.⁹

The Tenement House Committee of the C.O.S. evolved and changed over the years but it continued to play the role of watchdog over housing legislation and enforcement

⁹For a full account see Ray Lubone, The Progressives and the Slums (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1962).

and to represent the interests of low income tenements in New York. Much of its support was given initially to model tenements and "philanthropy at five percent." As time went on, it encountered serious difficulties in obtaining support for limited dividend housing by entrepreneurs. Only with great reluctance did it tentatively recommend a public housing program as a possible solution to the housing needs of the low income families. The committee supported public housing when it was enacted in the United States by the Housing Act of 1937. The New York Public Housing Program began in 1939.

CHAPTER II

PUBLIC HOUSING IN THE UNITED STATES

The principle of public housing was first used in the United States during World War I to provide homes, not for the poor, but for workers in defence industries and the shipyards.

The principle was reviewed by the Public Works Administration during the New Deal administration of President Franklin Roosevelt under the Industrial Recovery Act of 1933. The emphasis was on creating jobs for unemployed workers in the building industry more than in housing the poor. A Federal Housing Administration was created in 1934; however, public housing projects were abandoned at that time due to political and legal opposition.

The Public Housing Program in the United States really began with the Wagner Housing Act of 1937. Under this act, the federal government was to supply funds but public housing was to be administered at the local level.

Public Housing during the Truman administration encountered difficulties and was nearly removed from the Housing Act of 1949. These difficulties continued throughout much of the Eisenhower administration. Albert Cole, who acted as Housing and Home Finance Administrator,

stopped just short of open opposition to public housing in the United States.

During the Kennedy administration efforts were made to eliminate racial discrimination in public housing. A greater stress was placed on providing social services to tenants in public housing than in producing new units. The emphasis on providing social services and therapy with a manager-social work approach to public housing was not enthusiastically received by either local authorities or tenants. At the grass roots, there was greater support for a community action approach to public housing.

Under the War on Poverty begun by President Johnson and as a result of his National Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, public housing in the United States showed a new vitality. There was a considerable increase in the number of new units built. Also, a Rent Supplement Program was introduced at that time. Under this plan, low income tenants could rent accommodations in the private market and a supplement would be given to make up the difference between what rent they could afford to pay and the actual rent charged. The program was originally intended for tenants whose income was too high for public housing but too low to afford rents in the private market. It was modified to apply to families whose incomes were too low for public housing.

As a result of increasing costs over the years for the operation of public housing projects, local authorities

were required to raise rents. Many low income tenants were forced to pay up to 80 percent of their income for rent. Under the leadership of Senators Brooks and Sparkman, amendments to the housing acts were introduced in 1969 limiting the rent of public housing tenants to 25 percent of income and specifying that federal subsidies not be limited to capital costs but be available as well to the local authorities for operating expenses. In spite of these actions, however, considerable difficulties due to rising costs and limited funds continue to hamper public housing projects in the United States.

Under President Nixon, there were substantial reductions in all housing subsidy programs. The number of publicly owned housing starts began to decline with the Nixon administration and the downward spiral has continued.

The Housing Development Act of 1974, under President Ford, made changes to the public housing law, began a new program for leased housing and a new program called Urban Homesteading, whereby abandoned buildings may be purchased by low income families from the cities for a small fee.¹⁰

¹⁰ Norma L. Newmark and Patricia J. Thompson, Self, Space and Shelter: An Introduction to Housing (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1977), pp. 199-214.

CHAPTER III

PUBLIC HOUSING IN CANADA

Albert Rose noted in his extensive study of Canada's first public housing project at Regent Park in Toronto:

Public Housing has failed to develop in Canada on any real scale during the first half of the present century. This is quite unlike the situation in most Western countries including the United States. No organization was built on a national scale in this country which might have been adapted to meet the post war burdens.¹¹

There is evidence that many of the problems that were plaguing most industrial cities in Britain and the United States were beginning to make their presence felt in Canada in the 1930's, perhaps as early as 1919. A report by the Montreal Board of Trade and the City Improvement League in 1935 outlined some of these problems. It noted that slums, though small, were beginning to appear in Montreal. Also, there were few apartments available at prices that low income families could afford. The problem of overcrowding and the practice of taking in roomers was noted, as well as the rising incidents of tuberculosis and juvenile delinquency. It called for the direct

¹¹ Albert Rose, Regent Park: A Study in Slum Clearance (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), p. 21.

intervention by the federal government at the municipal level. It recommended that the social aspects of tenants be considered first and foremost. The report supported the development of public housing.¹²

The first National Housing Act was passed as the Dominion Housing Act of 1935. It empowered the Economic Council to investigate the feasibility of housing schemes designed to construct houses for low wage earners and was proposed by urban and rural authorities. The act provided for a loan not exceeding twenty percent towards the cost of construction.¹³

This legislation marked a cautious beginning by the federal government towards a public housing program. The act was not very effective in providing housing for the low income workers.

The National Housing Act of 1938 set out to correct this defect. Its stated purpose was stimulating "the construction of houses to be owned by persons with small incomes." The act called for what it described as "a limited experiment in low-rental housing" to create employment and to draw attention to housing problems. The bill provided assistance to local housing authorities to build

¹²Montreal, P.Q., Joint Committee of the Montreal Board of Trade and the City Improvement League, A Report on Housing and Slum Clearance for Montreal, 1935.

¹³Canada, Statutes, Dominion Housing Act, 1935, 25-26, Parts 1-11, George V, Chapter 58, p. 353.

low-rental housing.¹⁴ The legislation, however, was not widely used to develop public housing.

The National Housing Act of 1944 provided for grants to municipalities for slum clearance which were coupled with the requirement that slum areas cleared be used for the building of low-rental housing.

A Crown Corporation, The Wartime Housing Limited, set up in 1941 to provide homes for munitions workers, built approximately 20,000 units. At the end of the war, some of these were made available to veterans.

In 1945, a new Crown Corporation, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, was created to administer the government's housing programs.

By 1949, 40,000 veteran families were living in government owned housing.¹⁵ Although the idea was proposed that these units might eventually be used to house low-income families, the idea was rejected in favour of their sale to veterans.

The first major public housing project was initiated in Regent Park North in downtown Toronto, in 1948. The major cost of the project was covered by municipal funds.¹⁶

¹⁴Canada, Statutes, National Housing Act, 1938, 2, Parts 1-11, George VI, Chapter 49, p. 353.

¹⁵Canada, Central Mortgage and Housing, Housing in Canada, 1940-1970, Ottawa, 1970.

¹⁶For an account of the project see the previously cited work, Albert Rose, Regent Park: A Study in Slum Clearance.

In 1949, the National Housing Act was amended to provide federal rent subsidies for public housing projects. The amendment provided for a 75:25 percent cost sharing between the federal and provincial governments for the assembly of land and the building of homes for rent or sale. Under this plan, one hundred and forty subsidized units were completed for occupancy in St. John's, Newfoundland, in 1951. The amendment had resulted in only 3,000 low-rental units by 1955 with another 2,500 authorized. Though a beginning was being made, almost no social housing had been built from 1944 to 1954.

In the period from 1958 to 1964, only about 15,000 public rental units were built.¹⁷ The major thrust of the Canadian government housing policy up until 1964 was an assisted free-market approach. Historically, such an approach has provided few, if any, adequate dwellings for the lowest income earners. Also, legislation had placed strong emphasis on requests from the local level for social housing. Few requests for public housing were made.

A major overhauling of housing legislation took place in Canada in 1964. An amendment to the Housing Act allowed Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to offer 90 percent public housing loans directly to governments. In order to take advantage of these federal loans, the

¹⁷Dan Burns, "Housing Policy," Canadian Social Policy, ed. Shankar A. Yelaja (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978), p. 90.

provinces were required to enact enabling legislation.

In 1964, the province of Ontario established its own housing agency, Ontario Housing Corporation, to develop programs to meet the needs of low-income families. All existing public housing was absorbed into its management. Burns notes:

. . . the provincial housing corporations, particularly the Ontario Housing Corporation (O.H.C.) have provided most of the social housing in Canada to date.¹⁸

By the 1960's then, Canada had begun to learn what had been learned in the United States in the late 1920's and much earlier in Britain, that the unassisted free market approach was inadequate in providing housing at rates low income families could pay. In the 1960's, Canada began to turn more to social housing as a solution. In this approach, the free market is still used to provide housing for the middle and upper third of the income scale, but the government intervenes to provide housing for those whose needs cannot be met by the free market.

The Task Force on Housing Development led by the Minister of Housing, Paul Hellyer, reported in 1969 and was very critical of public housing as it existed at that time. During the life of the Task Force, a freeze was placed on further housing projects. The freeze was later lifted.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 93.

The Low Income Housing Task Force, chaired by Michael Dennis, was also very critical of public housing. It recommended the dropping of the public housing program in favour of a direct housing allowance to low income families.

A Ministry of State for Urban Affairs was created in 1971.

A revised bill to amend the National Housing Act was brought before Parliament in 1973. It contained legislation to upgrade existing residential areas and for rehabilitation of housing. It provided 100 percent loans at preferred rates of interest for non-profit housing corporations, as well as funds for cooperative housing and for research. Provisions were also made to improve housing for Indians living on reservations.

From 1969 to 1976, the number of new public housing units built under the National Housing Act, Section 43, has been consistently above 9,000 units. There was a substantial drop in 1977 and 1978.¹⁹ The largest number of units built between 1964-1978 were built in Ontario, the number of units being 81,866.

Lawrence B. Smith, in his review of Canadian housing policy, notes:

¹⁹Canada, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Data and Systems, Canadian Housing Statistics, 1978, Table 62, Ottawa, March 1979, p. 55.

During 1946-1969, government programs financed 38.4% of all housing units started in Canada, but only 4.4% of all starts were government-owned or specifically designed to assist low income households. During 1970-75, government programs still financed just under 40% of all housing starts, but 15.7% of all starts were specifically designed to assist low income households.²⁰

The figures refer only to new housing starts and ignore other government programs such as rent subsidies.

²⁰ Lawrence B. Smith, Anatomy of a Crisis: Canadian Housing Policy in the Seventies (Vancouver: Fraser Institute, 1977), p. 5.

CHAPTER IV

PUBLIC HOUSING: PROS AND CONS

The public housing program has been variously criticized and praised since its inception in the United States and Canada. Commenting on the friends and enemies of public housing during its first two decades of operation in the United States, Robert Moore Fisher²¹ notes that organized opposition came mostly from real estate and business groups, builders, suppliers and mortgage lenders. Their major criticism was that government interference disrupts the balance of the free market system and in addition tends to make the poor dependent on government assistance, which in turn destroys their incentive. These opposing groups were also concerned with increasing "socialism" in the United States. Other critics charge that public housing has failed to clear slums and rehouse the poorest families.

Proponents of public housing argue that the plan has made adequate housing available to low income families, often for the first time in their lives. They praise the plan for providing a decent, healthy environment and for

²¹Robert Moore Fisher, Twenty Years of Public Housing (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959).

reducing the costs to the community for police, fire, health and crime protection.

Referring to criticism of public housing leveled in the early 1950's, as well as praise, Fisher notes that up to that time, there had been no disinterested nationwide study to test allegations put forward by proponents and opponents.

In a reconsideration of the program to 1957, Fisher comments that the reliance on public ownership has both strengths and weaknesses. It has tended to impose more restraints on tenants than would be the case with private landlords.

Although the goals have not been clearly defined, Fisher recognizes three major objectives of the program: (1) the elimination of substandard housing; (2) provision of adequate housing for low income families; (3) the alleviation of unemployment.

Regarding the first objective, critics have charged that this demolition and rebuilding merely displaces the poor, transferring the blight to other neighbourhoods rather than eliminating it. Much high-rise public housing is criticized as "slums of the future."

In relating housing to income, Fisher cautions against a weakness in the system. Referring to the 1950 U.S. Census he notes:

Whatever the income level selected, a majority of primary families and individuals inhabited standard housing. . . . The lower the income, however, the greater the proportion of primary families and individuals occupying substandard housing.²²

He draws attention to the fact that tenants who exceed the set income limits in public housing must be evicted and replaced by low income tenants who pay less. This has had a serious burden on local housing authorities which, until amendments to the Housing Act in the 1960's,²³ had to pay the operating expenses of public housing projects, with the rents collected.

Fisher concedes that an overall assessment of a complex program such as public housing is difficult:

The exact costs and benefits of the program are not readily calculable. Many cannot be measured in dollars. Others may be only approximated in monetary terms because numerous variables are involved and available measures are incomplete. Results so far may not be entirely indicative of long-run costs and benefits.

Referring to the public housing program in the United States in the late 1940's and the 1950's, Richard Davies²⁴ notes the reductions in funds by the Congress and the resulting decrease in public housing units constructed. However, he considers the major source of disillusionment

²²Ibid.

²³See Daniel R. Mandelker, "Brooke Amendment," Housing Subsidies in the United States and England, particularly Chapter IV (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1973).

²⁴Richard Davies, Housing Reform During the Truman Administration (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1966), pp. 137-142.

as being the failure of public housing to reduce the social disorders of crime, vice, broken families and juvenile delinquency. Even uncleanness and dilapidation had not been greatly reduced. He concludes that poor housing does not lie at the root of these social disorders, but rather poor housing results from, and is not the basic cause of these conditions.

Gilbert Steiner²⁵ describes public housing as "a means test relief program assisting about 2.5 million poor people by increasing the availability to them of a necessary commodity--low rent housing--inadequately supplied by private enterprise."

Referring to availability of public housing units, Steiner notes "the number of available dwelling units is far smaller than is the universe of eligible poor."

Public housing tenants are identified as people "who are not very successful." He suggests that the stigma might be reduced by making public housing more attractive to non-needy persons. "Only about 10 percent of the poverty income population lives in public housing or benefits from rent supplement."²⁶

²⁵Gilbert Y. Steiner, The State of Welfare (Washington: The Brookings Institute, 1971).

²⁶See J. S. Fuerst, "Public Housing in the United States," Public Housing in Europe and America, ed. J. S. Fuerst (London: Croom Helm Ltd., 1974), Chapter 10, p. 134.

He observes that a substantial number of eligible people are not interested in public housing because it is inconveniently located, because racially integrated housing is distasteful to them or because the quality of life in public housing is badly regarded.

Steiner is also critical of tenant-landlord relations in public housing projects in the United States.

He points out that in striving to seek a balance between providing a social service and merely providing adequate shelter, public housing authorities have failed to attain either.

The ambivalence between a brick and mortar activity and a social welfare activity ends in castigation from supporters of each who feel, quite properly, that the program has not made sufficient progress in either area.²⁷

Daniel Mandelker²⁸ draws attention to the difficulties that local housing authorities have had in their efforts to pay for upkeep and maintenance of public housing projects out of rent incomes. This resulted in a greatly increased rent burden on public housing tenants, in general, and welfare recipients, in particular. The Brooke Amendments to the National Housing Act have not been completely successful in correcting these difficulties.

²⁷Ibid., p. 127.

²⁸Daniel R. Mandelker, Housing Subsidies in the United States and England. See particularly Chapters III & IV.

Henry Aaron²⁹ questions the fairness of public housing which provides adequate housing for a small fraction of low income households and provides nothing to most of the rest. He says: "Local housing authorities have had to decide whether to stay financially solvent or to help only the neediest families. They have aimed for solvency."

Housing authorities decide the number of tenants admitted to public housing for each income level. They also refuse admission to families with characteristics they consider unacceptable. Aaron concludes that the end result is that a very small fraction of the lowest income brackets are admitted into public housing projects.

Lawrence Friedman³⁰ criticizes the quality of construction of public housing in the United States. The program he notes "has tended to degenerate into a program to build high-rise ghettos for Negroes in big cities or alternately, to abandon the lowest class altogether." He refers to the problem created by the refusal of middle-class, urban society to receive the poor as neighbours. This attitude has been one of the greatest obstacles to public housing in the United States.

²⁹Henry J. Aaron, Shelter and Subsidies: Who Benefits From Federal Housing Policies? (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1972), pp. 114-126.

³⁰Lawrence M. Friedman, Government and Slum Housing: A Century of Frustration (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1968), pp. 197-198.

Chester Hartman³¹ believes there is a stigma attached to living in public housing. Project residents are isolated from the surrounding community and social problems are concentrated in projects. The isolation is both social and physical. Many projects are located far from shopping and other services. The transportation is either non-existent or of very poor quality. The projects themselves are often dreary and unimaginative, designed to humiliate the poor for not paying their own way in the free market system--a system unable to provide accommodations that the poor can afford.

He points out that three million low income Americans live in public housing or about 1.5 percent of the population of the United States. About two-fifths of all public housing households are elderly (62 years or older); also, about two-fifths of all public housing families are welfare recipients. He estimates that fifteen percent of all families in public housing are living in overcrowded accommodations. That is to say, a density greater than 1.0 persons per room exists for 15% of all families in public housing.

He is of the opinion that tenant dissatisfaction is high within public housing, particularly in the larger projects and cities.

Poverty is increasingly seen as the principal cause of housing problems. For this reason, an increasing number

³¹Chester H. Hartman, Housing and Social Policy (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975).

of commentators are recommending income support approaches to the problem. This method, it is believed, will offer low income families the opportunity to choose their own housing in keeping with the life style of their choice. In this way, it is hoped that much administrative costs and unwieldy rules and regulations of housing authorities could be reduced or maybe eliminated.³²

The problems facing the public housing program in Canada are, in many ways, similar to the difficulties experienced in the United States. Criticisms of both programs tend to be similar.

Canada also has had difficulties producing sufficient units. Referring to the first decade of public housing in Canada, Albert Rose³³ notes "the total number of units available for rent to low income families up to 1960 did not exceed 15,000."

Like many commentators on the housing scene in the United States, I. R. Silver³⁴ considers the housing problems in Canada to be primarily an income problem. He notes

³²See Morton L. Isler, Thinking About Housing: A Policy Research Agenda (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1975). See particularly Chapter 2.

³³Dr. Albert Rose, Canadian Housing Policies, Canadian Conference on Housing, Background Paper No. 2, Toronto, June 1968, p. 39.

³⁴Canada, Ministry of State for Urban Affairs, Housing and the Poor, by I. R. Silver, Working Paper A71.2, Ottawa, 1971, p. 21.

that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the number of persons requiring housing assistance and the number occupying substandard housing. He believes it is necessary to concentrate on general economic assistance to low income families not just housing assistance.

Michael Dennis and Susan Fish, in their report on low income housing in Canada in 1971, also drew attention to the small number of public housing units produced, an average of only 834 units per year during the 1940's and early 1950's. The report was very critical of public housing in Canada and suggested the program had a lack of concern for the quality of life in projects.

The federal program, according to the report, had a lack of goals and objectives and a policy which the report called "demand responsive." Dennis and Fish believed this policy was responsible for the limited production of public housing units.

The report disapproved of overcrowding among many families with children and named this overcrowding as the cause of such problems as friction with neighbours, vandalism and school problems.

Dennis and Fish criticized housing authorities for their slowness as landlords to respond to the needs of tenants. They noted, with dismay, that public housing tenants did not acquire leases until 1970 and noted that these leases protected the interests of the housing authority at

the expense of the tenants' rights. The report also criticized the lack of tenant participation in project decisions that greatly affected their lives.

Dennis and Fish, in their report, recommended that public housing, which it defined as "the construction of new, highly-subsidized units to be owned by the public and occupied by the poor"³⁵ be abandoned. It justified this drastic action by citing the poor locations of projects, problems of building design, over-concern for costs resulting in too much high density, highrise housing, insensitive management and negative attitudes towards public housing in surrounding neighbourhoods and the public, generally.

In place of the public housing program, the report recommended the payment of a shelter allowance to low income households.

³⁵Michael Dennis & Susan Fish, Programs in Search of a Policy: Low Income Housing in Canada (Toronto: Hakkert, 1972).

CHAPTER V

RENT SUPPLEMENT: AN ALTERNATIVE TO PUBLIC HOUSING?

In this chapter I shall trace the development of the Rent Supplement program in the United States and in Ontario.

A Rent Supplement program was introduced by President Johnson as part of the War on Poverty in the United States. Under this plan, low income tenants could rent accommodations in the private market and a supplement would be given to make up the difference between what rent they could afford to pay and the actual rent charged. Under the housing bill passed by the U. S. Congress on June 30, 1965 an eligible person pays an amount equal to 25 percent of his income. Government supplement pays the rest.³⁶ To be eligible persons must have an income low enough to have them qualify for public housing.

Opponents of the Rent Supplement program criticized the high cost. They also charged that it reduced the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts. Proponents saw the Rent Supplement program as an important alternative to public housing.

³⁶United States, Congress, The Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, Vol. 23, No. 27, July 2, 1965, pp. 1-2.

A few rent subsidy experiments were sponsored by the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the United States before the Rent Supplement program proposed by President Lyndon Johnson.

In addition to a rent supplement program in Boston,³⁷ several other areas in the United States had similar programs in operation before the plan was incorporated in the housing legislation of 1965. These areas were: Chicago, with a rent supplement program for about 100 elderly low-income families; San Francisco, with a plan that subsidizes the rents of sixty low-income families which are interspersed among middle-income families; St. Louis, where the rents of twenty low-income families displaced by urban renewal are subsidized; and New Haven, which has a subsidy plan for the rents of low-income families in standard, privately owned and managed apartments.³⁸

The Hellyer Report on Housing and Urban Development³⁹ criticized large public housing projects as "ghettos of the poor." The report contended that these public housing

³⁷See Joe R. Feagin, Charles Tilly, & Constance W. Williams, Subsidizing the Poor: A Boston Housing Experiment (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1972). See Chapter 3 in particular, pp. 48-49.

³⁸For a review of the Rent Supplement Program in the United States during its first four years in operation, see Byron Fielding, "How Useful are Rent Supplements in Meeting Low-Income Housing Needs?" Journal of Housing, Vol. 26, No. 1 (January 1969), pp. 12-17.

³⁹Report of the Federal Task Force on Housing and Urban Development, by Paul T. Hellyer, Chairman (Ottawa, Canada: Queen's Printer, 1969).

projects did not provide adequate social services for problem families and that they lacked adequate recreational facilities, particularly for children. These public housing projects resulted in stigma for tenants and increased bitterness and alienation among tenants, as well. To remedy this stigma and alienation, it recommended a subsidized rental program to provide dispersed single dwelling units for needy families. It also recommended that "income supplements in the form of rent certificates could be provided on an appropriate scale so that the recipient could rent housing in the private market according to his individual and family needs."⁴⁰

Referring to the rent supplement concept, Jerome Dasso⁴¹ notes:

Basically, the idea is that all individuals or families should be enabled to occupy privately-owned housing units of an acceptable quality; any difference between the economic rent of a particular unit and the amount the tenant is able to pay, based on some proportion of his income being allocated for housing, will be made up by a supplemental payment by the government.

One of the benefits of the program listed by Dasso is that the rent supplement program "avoids the stigma so often experienced by people living in public housing."

One advantage of rent supplements, according to proponents of the program is that it offers low-income

⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 54-57.

⁴¹ Jerome Dasso, "An Evaluation of Rent Supplements," Land Economics 44(4) (November 1968):441-449.

families an opportunity to interact with families of higher socioeconomic status. The arrangement, it is believed, helps higher status families to become acquainted with the poor, to learn of their problems and to accept the poor as human persons; while the lower class families are given "models for new and better behaviour patterns." William H. Michelson⁴² cites considerable research to refute this theory. He concludes:

Completely random placement of working class residents among middle-class neighbours results in the isolation of the former rather than in any intended, positive result.⁴³

The Rent Supplement Program began in Ontario in 1971. It is administered by the Ministry of Housing through the Ontario Housing Corporation. Its purpose is to provide assisted rental housing for lower-income residents in the private sector. It seeks to integrate socially-assisted tenants into the general community. The authority for the program is the National Housing Act, Section 44, the (Ontario) Housing Development Amendment Act, 1974, Section 2 (1) (f) and Ontario Housing Corporation Act R.S.O., 1970, Section 6. The federal government pays 50% of the subsidies involved in the Rent Supplement Program.

⁴²William H. Michelson, Man and His Urban Environment: A Sociological Approach (Don Mills, Ont.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970). See particularly Chapter 5, pp. 119-122.

⁴³Ibid., p. 130.

Ontario Housing Corporation signs agreements with the private landlord who is willing to make units available to lower-income families. The landlord and the Ontario Housing Corporation agree on a market rent; the landlord participates in selecting tenants from local waiting lists for assisted housing. Tenants sign a lease with the landlord and pay rent directly to him. Ontario Housing Corporation mail a monthly cheque to the landlord to cover the differences between that rent and the agreed market rent. Contracts are signed for five years with rents renegotiated annually. The municipal councils must pass a resolution to participate in the program and must pay 7 1/2% of the operating subsidies.⁴⁴

At present, 9,037 Rent Supplement Program units were administered by the Ontario Housing Corporation at the end of 1977. Rent supplement payments to landlords in Ontario, in 1977, were \$15,267,120.⁴⁵

⁴⁴Ontario, Ministry of Housing, Community Renewal Branch, Community Improvement Resource Kit, J. F. Brown, Director (Toronto, Ontario, July 1977), Section IV, D, pp. 1, 2 and 21.

⁴⁵Ontario, Ministry of Housing, Annual Report, 1977/78, p. 27.

CHAPTER VI

A SUMMARY

The Industrial Revolution caused an influx of workers into the cities seeking employment in the factories. The free market was not able to provide enough houses at prices workers could afford to pay. More and more people were crowded into deteriorating housing. The slum was born with its increased incidence of disease, death, poverty and crime.

As a solution to this growing social problem of the slum and to meet the urgent need for housing for low-income families, a public housing program was developed. Under this plan, the state built houses and rented them at prices that low-income families could afford.

The chief opposition to the program came from proponents of laissez faire economics who held the free market to be sacred and not to be defiled by government intervention. Public housing received wider public and government support in Britain than was the case in the United States where the parsimony of the Congress and a wide-spread terror of socialism were successfully manipulated by building, real estate and other business interests to greatly diminish efforts to develop public housing.

Canada's solutions to the housing problem are unique only to the extent that they represent the middle road between "the socialist-philia" of Britain and "the socialist-phobia" of the United States regarding government intervention in the housing market. Innovation and originality in developing housing programs have been rare commodities in Canada, indeed. This country has for the most part applied to its own problems, American and British solutions to American and British problems.

Critics of public housing contend that this program increases stigma and alienation, that it does not provide a satisfactory quality of life to tenants or contribute to their overall well-being. They maintain that public housing creates a ghetto for the poor, isolating them from the community and not offering them opportunities to participate in recreational activities or community organizations. These critics charge that public housing projects are not conducive to good mental or physical health and that the programs are considered unsatisfactory by public housing tenants themselves.

Proponents of the rent supplement program maintain that the program reduces stigma and alienation and that it enables greater contact and social interaction between lower and higher socioeconomic groups; that it gives the poor more access to social activities and enables them to escape from the ghetto effect and the social isolation of public housing projects. Proponents of a rent supplement

program contend that the program provides an environment conducive to a higher quality of life and creates a higher state of overall well-being for tenants than does the public housing program.

There is very little empirical evidence provided by research to substantiate the claims or counter-claims of proponents of either public housing or the rent supplement program.

CHAPTER VII

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In a review of the literature on public housing in Canada, Adepoju A. Onibokun⁴⁶ comments that public housing has been criticized and stigmatized but little empirical research has been conducted to ascertain the validity of these criticisms. The research in housing in Canada had, he believed, four main defects: (1) There was very little research on public housing; (2) on housing consumers' behaviour and attitudes; (3) an over-concentration of research in the largest urban centers of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver; (4) and an inadequacy in many of the studies of the methodology.

Much research effort in Canada in the 1930's and 1940's was directed towards assessing housing needs. The Royal Commission on Dominion Provincial Relations in 1939 and the Advisory Committee on Reconstruction in 1944 both studied residential accommodation in Canada and estimated the expected housing shortage.

⁴⁶Canada, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Public Housing in Canada: Research in Urban Renewal and Low-Income Housing, by Adepoju G. Onibokun, ed. Nancy E. Davies, Ottawa, 1972, Vol. 8, No. 3, p. 2.

He notes:

With regard to public or low-rental housing, however, both scientific and empirical research is very meager. Public housing in Canada has many critics but very few analysts.⁴⁷

The lack of research is particularly noticeable in the area of consumers' satisfaction with housing, both public and private. In this area he says, "In Canada, literature and completed research are almost negligible."⁴⁸

Shirley S. Angrist⁴⁹ in an overview of recent themes and directions in social research on housing in the United States comments that the research has become interdisciplinary including psychology, anthropology, architecture and urban planning. A major theme has been physical determinism, supporting the view that housing influences shape how people live. In opposition is the view that people select environments according to their desired life style and that the interaction of the person and his environment affects both the person and the environment. Physical determinism and reaction against it form a major focus in housing research.

The concept of neighbourhood continues to be an important construct in housing research. In studies of

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 4.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 6.

⁴⁹Shirley S. Angrist, "Social Research on Housing in the United States: Direction and Themes," Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 3(2) (November 1972): 117-124.

low-income families much attention has been given to the concept of "culture of poverty" developed by Oscar Lewis and the relative importance of dwelling and neighbourhood to the client's satisfaction and adjustment. There is still debate on the issue of sociological determinism regardless of physical setting. The problems are seen as inherent in the poor themselves. The problem of crowding and its relationship to social problems is being re-examined. The use of space and the importance of privacy or the lack of it, are receiving attention in the literature. The other major area of emphasis in research is in determining the type of living accommodations that people prefer and how satisfied they feel with the dwelling they inhabit.

One of the most comprehensive studies of the effects of housing on health and social psychological adjustment was a longitudinal study undertaken from John Hopkins University in 1954.⁵⁰ The study compared two matched groups of families: a test group that moved from the slums into public housing and a control group that remained in the substandard housing of the slum. The data was obtained through personal interviews and from public agency records.

In a review of forty selected researchers done in preparation for the study, Wilner et al. found of 24 studies

⁵⁰ Daniel M. Wilner, Rosabelle Price Walkley and Thomas C. Pinkerton, The Housing Environment and Family Life: A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Housing on Morbidity and Mental Health (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1962).

involving physical morbidity, 15 showed positive findings, seven seemed ambiguous or showed no relationship between housing and health, and two found negative results. Of the 16 studies dealing with social adjustment, 11 found positive relationships between the variables, four gave ambiguous or null results and one was negative.⁵¹

In the John Hopkins study, the rehoused group showed better physical health for persons under 35 years of age and especially for children than the group remaining in poor housing. The hypothesis was not confirmed for persons of age 35-37.⁵² The test group were more likely than the control group to be free from illness, but the differences in the two groups were not statistically significant. The rehoused group expressed greater satisfaction with their dwelling, their children's play areas and their privacy and reported less friction related to space. They also showed more amicable relations with neighbours than did the group remaining in substandard housing.⁵³

Better family relations as indicated by mothers' reactions to and discipline of children and the number of common family activities were significantly higher in the test group.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 5.

⁵²Ibid., p. 243.

⁵³Ibid., p. 248.

Test respondents showed more pride in their immediate neighbourhoods than did control respondents and gave more favourable views regarding the project as a place to live. However, satisfaction with proximity to various facilities and evaluations of Baltimore as a place to live showed no significant test-control differences.

Test respondents, more than control respondents, indicated a perceived improvement in their position in life. However, there was no significant increase in aspirations regarding such things as home ownership, better jobs or a better future for their children.

There was a significant increase in scores pertaining to self in the test group as compared with the control group. School performance was better in the test group than in the control group. This factor may have been, in part, due to better school attendance which was considerably higher for the test group than for the control group.

A study of health among tenants was carried out in Toronto in 1953 in Canada's first public housing project at Regent Park (North). Interviews were conducted with a stratified random sample of 62 of the 547 households who had been rehoused as part of a slum clearance project. The tenants were asked a number of questions about changes in their psychological and physical health since their move to the public housing project. Most (70 percent) of the 62 tenants interviewed expressed the view that the family, as a whole, was more contented in the new home. A majority of

the tenants indicated an improvement in their psychological and physical health. A majority also expressed satisfaction with neighbours and the community in general.⁵⁴

In a study of an experimental rent supplement program conducted from June, 1964 to June, 1966 in Boston, Joe R. Feagin, Charles Tilly and Constance W. Williams⁵⁵ were able to compare a matched sample of tenants relocated in public housing with a group being rehoused in a rent supplement program. Interviews were conducted before and after the families were moved as part of a slum clearance project. A larger percent of the rent supplement group than of the public housing group reported being more satisfied with their new homes as to size, nearness to services and quality of neighbourhood than their former homes.⁵⁶ In regard to informal ties in the two groups studied, they reported a decrease in the percent of tenants visiting neighbours in both the rent supplement and the public housing groups. However, there was an increase in talking with neighbours by the group moving to the rent supplement program and a decrease in this activity by those moving to public housing.⁵⁷ In regard to voluntary associations' participation

⁵⁴Albert Rose, Regent Park: A Study in Slum Clearance, pp. 131-152.

⁵⁵Joe R. Feagin, Charles Tilly & Constance W. Williams, Subsidizing the Poor: A Boston Housing Experiment.

⁵⁶Ibid., Table 6-4, pp. 103, 105.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 112.

by both groups, it was found to be negligible. The rent supplement group showed a greater decrease in anxiety/pessimism than did the public housing group.

The study concludes that on most characteristics assessed, public housing respondents were more likely to express dissatisfaction than subsidy (rent supplement) respondents.⁵⁸

In a study⁵⁹ to determine preferences, a group of tenants who had lived for two months in a rent supplement program in Philadelphia were asked to choose from a list, the type of housing they would choose if they had a free choice. The list included: a regular house or apartment which they could afford, an elevator public housing unit, a row house public housing unit, a public housing used house⁶⁰ and a rent subsidized apartment or house. Most (36 percent) chose a public housing used house. The only other types chosen with any degree of frequency were rent subsidized units (25 percent) and row house public housing units (24 percent). Elevator public housing apartments and accommodations in the market, available at rents that the

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 122.

⁵⁹Marilyn Langford Reeves, Philadelphia Rent Subsidy Program: A Local Approach Using Private Market Housing (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1969), pp. 18-19.

⁶⁰The United States has a plan of leasing already existing houses in the private market for use by public housing tenants.

tenants could afford, were rejected by all but one or two families.⁶¹

Alienation

The Dictionary of Social Service: Policy and Practice defines alienation as "a state of mind in which the individual feels a sense of separation from society."⁶² It notes that the term has a number of different meanings which are variously used in relation to sociology, psychology and philosophy.

In a discussion of the meaning of alienation, Melvin Seeman⁶³ identified five alternative meanings of the term derived from traditional sociological analysis. These are: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement.

Dwight G. Dean considers the concept of alienation (as having three major components: powerlessness, normlessness and social isolation. In studies he found "that with increased status in society, there is less of a feeling of alienation." He also found low negative correlation between the three components of alienation and education, income

⁶¹Marilyn Langford Reeves, Philadelphia Rent Subsidy Program: A Local Approach Using Private Market Housing, p. 19.

⁶²Dictionary of Social Service: Policy and Practice (London: Bedford Square Press of the National Council of Social Service, 1971).

⁶³Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 24 (December 1959): 783-791.

and rural background. There was a positive correlation between alienation and advancing age.⁶⁴

Russell Middleton⁶⁵ was able to demonstrate that the different types of alienation, namely, powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness and social estrangement are highly correlated and that alienation is directly related to subordinate social status and low educational attainment. He found that a special type of alienation, typified by the intellectual who rejects popular culture, was not highly correlated with the other variants of alienation.

A factor analysis of Dean's alienation scale led Richard Dodder⁶⁶ to the conclusion that the scale did not measure the three dimensions defined by Dean. He concluded that the scale measured "retreatist alienation, expressing detachment and despair and the feeling that the world promises nothing in the way of comfort or support."⁶⁷

⁶⁴Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review 26 (October 1961): 753-758.

⁶⁵Russell Middleton, "Alienation, Race and Education," American Sociological Review 28 (December 1963): 973-977.

⁶⁶Richard A. Dodder, "A Factor Analysis of Dean's Alienation Scale," Social Forces 48(2) (December 1969): 252-255.

⁶⁷For a further evaluation of measures of alienation see J. L. Simmons, "Some Inter-Correlations Among Alienation Measures," Social Forces 44 (March 1966): 370-371. See also Arthur G. Neal and Salomon Rettig, "On the Multi-Dimensionality of Alienation," American Sociological Review 32 (February 1967): 54-64.

Wendell Bell⁶⁸ found higher rates of alienation (anomie) among persons living in low economic status neighbourhoods, characterized by low education and low income, than among persons living in high economic status neighbourhoods. Also, social isolation in low-income areas was correlated with anomie. This correlation did not hold in high economic areas. A correlation was also found between anomie and formal group participation.

A study by Dorothy Meier and Wendell Bell⁶⁹ indicates that one of the variants of alienation, normlessness or anomie may be the result of an individual's lack of access to the means of achieving life goals.

In a study of women in a low-income housing project, Larry D. Barrett⁷⁰ found that the amount of education influenced both the degree of anomie⁷¹ and the degree of achievement. Annual income was found not to be related to either anomie or achievement in this study.

⁶⁸Wendell Bell, "Anomie, Social Isolation and the Class Structure," Sociometry 20 (June 1957): 105-116.

⁶⁹Dorothy Meier and Wendell Bell, "Anomie and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals," American Sociological Review 24 (April 1959): 189-202.

⁷⁰Larry D. Barrett, "Achievement Values and Anomie Among Women in a Low-Income Housing Project," Social Forces 49 (September 1970): 127-134.

⁷¹For a measure of anomie see Leo Srole, "A Measure of Anomie," American Sociological Review 21 (December 1956): 712-713.

In a study of six public housing projects for the non-elderly, Daniel J. Amick and Frederick J. Kviz⁷² demonstrated that alienation is related to the type of building. There was less alienation in low-rise dwellings than in high-rise dwellings.

Stigma

The Greeks used the term "stigma" in reference to signs or marks cut or burned into the flesh of individuals to designate an inferior social rank such as that of a slave, a criminal or a traitor. Stigma, in this sense, was the theme of Nathaniel Hawthorne's classic, The Scarlet Letter.

In discussing some preliminary concepts of stigma, Erving Goffman⁷³ reminds us that society establishes the means of categorizing persons and the complement of attributes appropriate for each of these categories. A stigma refers to an attribute of a person that makes him stand out as being different in a derogatory way and relegates him to unprestigious social roles. A person "is thus reduced in our minds from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one."

⁷²Daniel J. Amick and Frederick J. Kviz, "Density, Building Type and Social Integration in Public Housing Projects," Man--Environment Systems (May 1974): 187-190.

⁷³Erving Goffman, Stigma Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963). See particularly pp. 1-10.

The discrediting effect can be very extensive and be extended to a very wide range of social activity. He identifies three different types of stigma: (1) physical deformities, (2) blemishes of character where persons with the stigma are perceived as being morally weak or inferior, (3) the tribal stigma of race, nation, and religion which can be transmitted through lineages and can contaminate all members of a family or group.

A person with a stigma is "not quite human." Thus, discrimination may be used against him--reducing his life chances. The extent of the visibility of a stigma will determine the extent of stigmatization. A very visible difference such as skin colour or facial features, for example, may be more likely to stigmatize an individual than a less visible one.

The high visibility of public housing has led critics to charge that it increases stigma. Elizabeth D. Huttman⁷⁴ who has studied public housing extensively in North America and Europe observes . . . "in the United States, for example, public welfare, mental hospital and public housing programs are highly stigmatized while old age survivors insurance, various educational scholarship programs and possibly medicare lack this negative label." Her research led her to conclude that there is less stigma attached to public

⁷⁴Elizabeth D. Huttman, "Factors Leading to Client Degradation in Welfare and Public Housing," Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare 1(1) (Fall 1973): 155.

housing (council housing) in Britain. This she attributes to public attitudes which are more willing to accept the state provision of housing. A study of government reports and hearings, as well as surveys of attitudes, indicates that the philosophy of laissez faire economics is much stronger in the United States than in Britain.

A measure of stigma developed by Joel F. Handler and Ellen Jane Hollingsworth⁷⁵ uses questions designed to tap the welfare recipient's perception of the attitudes held by others in the community, as well as his own feelings of embarrassment and the way he perceives the actions of the community towards him. He found that feelings of stigma do exist among welfare recipients but his indicators of stigma related weakly, or not at all, to such characteristics as race, employment experience, education, type of community, length of residence or friendships.

Patrick M. Horan and Patricia Lee Austin⁷⁶ reserve the term "stigma" for feelings of shame or degradation felt by the stigmatized person himself and not his perceptions of the views of others in the community. They feel that his internalization of a negative evaluation of themselves

⁷⁵Joel F. Handler and Ellen Jane Hollingsworth, The Deserving Poor: A Study of Welfare Administration, Institute for Research on Poverty Monograph (Chicago: Markham Publishing Company), 1971, pp. 166-178.

⁷⁶Patrick M. Horan and Patricia Lee Austin, "The Social Basis of Welfare Stigma," Social Problems 21(5): 648-657.

more truly represents stigma. Their study of welfare recipients demonstrated that those familiar with Welfare Rights Organizations were less likely to feel stigmatized. Another finding was that the more educated an individual, or the longer she has been on welfare, the more stigmatized she is likely to feel. The sample study was small (50 subjects) and too general an application of the findings would not be warranted.

A study of Family Benefits Mothers in Metropolitan Toronto conducted by the Research and Planning Branch of the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services found stigma, as a result of living on welfare, widely reported by respondents.⁷⁷ In regard to housing, the research showed that mothers in private rental units were more satisfied with the project as a place to bring up children than were mothers in public housing. This held true for every type of accommodation: detached or semi-detached house; row house or duplex; apartment, high-rise; apartment, non-high-rise; and flats or rooms.⁷⁸

In a study comparing tenants in 15 public housing projects in Kitchener, Guelph and Galt, in Ontario, with

⁷⁷ Ontario, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Research and Planning Branch, Family Benefits Mothers in Metropolitan Toronto, Jean M. James, Research Report No. 2, March 1973, pp. 75-79.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 180.

tenants in private rental housing projects, A. G. Onibokun⁷⁹ found that the public housing tenants encountered the problem of stigmatization. The low-income people in private rental projects, though living in houses of poorer quality, did not encounter the problem of stigma.

In a study of 452 female tenants from 25 public housing projects in a large American city, Jack Levin and Gerald Taube⁸⁰ found evidence of the stigmatization of low-status tenants. The stigmatized group, characterized as negro, low education, receiving welfare and husband absent, were less likely to obtain adequate housing-related services than higher status tenants characterized by white race, high education, non-recipient of welfare and husband present. The study also demonstrated that the low-status group displayed more participation or willingness to participate in project tenant councils. The lower status group were less knowledgeable about the decision-making power in the housing authority. They complained less and were more satisfied with public housing than the high-status group.

⁷⁹Adepoju G. Onibokun, Research, Environment and Planning 5(4) (1973): 471.

⁸⁰Jack Levin and Gerald Taub, "Bureaucracy and the Socially Handicapped: A Study of Lower-Status Tenants in Public Housing," Sociology and Social Research 54(2) (January 1970): 209-219.

A survey conducted in Stevenage, a city of 105,000 in England⁸¹ showed a majority of public housing (council) tenants and a majority of the citizens of the city believed there was no stigma (prejudice) attached to tenants of public (council) housing.⁸²

The Public Housing High-Rise

In a critical review of public housing in the United States, William H. Ledbetter, Jr.,⁸³ calls attention to the problems of design of public housing structures. He notes that though the high-rise, high density structure seems acceptable for middle and upper income groups, it presents special problems for the low-income group. He also notes the frequent indictment of public housing that it isolates and segregates low-income families.

⁸¹Valerie A. Karn, Stevenage Housing Survey: A Study of Housing in a New Town (Birmingham: Centre for Urban Studies, The University of Birmingham, 1970), pp. 42-43.

⁸²For a discussion of stigma and public housing in Australia, see M. A. Jones, Housing and Poverty in Australia (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1972), see Chapter 9, particularly p. 176; for a viewpoint of tenants of stigma in public housing, see Dorothy O'Connell, "Tenants View of Stigma in Public Housing," Housing and People 6(2) (Summer 1975): 10-12.

⁸³William H. Ledbetter, Jr., "Public Housing--A Social Experiment Seeks Acceptance," Law and Contemporary Problems 32 (1967): 490-527.

Robert E. Mitchell,⁸⁴ commenting on the criticism of high-rise public housing projects such as Pruitt-Igoe in St. Louis, suggests that to blame social problems on the physical features of housing is to overlook the more basic problems of poverty. He notes that high-rise apartments for university students and for higher income groups do not develop the serious problems reported in public housing high-rise projects. He observes that the problems of the poor develop no matter where they live. Mitchell concludes that there is not enough empirical evidence to suggest that high density dwelling units adversely affect emotional or family health.

A participant observation study of the Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in downtown St. Louis was carried out by Lee Rainwater⁸⁵ between the summer of 1963 through the summer of 1966. Pruitt-Igoe consists of 2,762 apartments in 33 eleven storey buildings. Rainwater-observes that "no other public housing project in the country approaches it in terms of vacancies, tenant concerns and anxieties, or physical deterioration." After two years of

⁸⁴Robert E. Mitchell, "Misconceptions About Man Made Space in Partial Defence of High Density Housing," The Family Coordinator 23 (January 1974): 51-56; see also James E. Montgomery, "Commentary on Misconceptions About Man Made Space," The Family Coordinator 23 (January 1974): 57-59.

⁸⁵Lee Rainwater, Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a Federal Slum (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970), see particularly Chapter 1.

field observation consisting of intensive interviews of tenants, a questionnaire was administered to a representative sample of residents.

Over half of the respondents listed concern for the safety of themselves or their children due to the high rate of crimes committed in the project. An equal concern was expressed regarding maintenance and construction of the project. The respondents spoke of the difficulties they encountered because the elevators stopped only on the fourth, seventh and tenth floors. Other problems mentioned included the presence of cockroaches and the use of elevators and halls to go to the bathroom.⁸⁶

Carol Fishel and Graham B. Spanier⁸⁷ did a three-year participant observation research in a public housing high-rise project in Chicago. The study draws attention to the effect of building structure of the high-rise on family life. One effect is an increase in danger due to crime--new and different forms of crime such as "elevator crime--whereby elevators are jammed and the trapped passengers are robbed. For their safety, children have to be

⁸⁶Lee Rainwater, "Fear and the House-As-Haven in the Lower Class," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 32(1) (January 1966): 23-31; see also Roger Montgomery's comment on "Fear and the House-As-Haven in the Lower Class," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 32(1) (January 1966): 31-37.

⁸⁷Graham B. Spanier and Carol Fishel, "The Housing Project and Familial Functions: Consequences for Low Income, Urban Families," The Family Coordinator 22(2) (April 1973): 235-240.

accompanied to and from school by their parents.

The structure of the project makes the supervision of the play of children difficult or impossible when the family lives on the twenty-first floor.

There are few food stores nearby and the few that are charge excessively high prices.

The buildings are described as "dirty, impersonal structures with cement walls and floors."

Families use whatever influence they can to get on lower floors where the residents can avoid using elevators. The research suggests that efforts to relocate projects in other neighbourhoods are not effective because such moves do not attack the major problem which the researcher believes to be the impact of the structure of the project building on family functioning. Their observations led them to conclude that "planners must think more of people and their needs, particularly their needs collectively as family units; than of the survival of the edifice or its material contents."

In a study of 442 residents of public housing projects in mid-sized Canadian cities, A. R. Gillis⁸⁸ found that in a high-rise women are more likely than men to experience psychological strain.

⁸⁸A. R. Gillis, "High Rise Housing and Psychological Strain," Journal of Health and Social Behaviour 18 (December 1977): 418-431.

A stratified probability sample was drawn from 39 public housing projects in Calgary and Edmonton. The types of dwellings included in the study were: single detached, semi-detached, four plex, row housing, apartments (3-4 floors) and high-rise apartments (8-16 floors). The study found that floor level had a positive correlation with psychological stress for women and a negative correlation with psychological stress for men. In the latter case, the correlation was weaker. These correlations were not made less by controlling for such factors as social isolation.⁸⁹

Donald N. Rothblatt⁹⁰ in a study of tenants in a public housing project in New York and tenants in a public housing project in The Hague, found that lower floor apartments seemed more responsive to family needs.⁹¹ He concluded that low-rise structures were preferable for families with children. He found that terraced buildings were more successful in meeting esteem needs⁹² than non-terraced

⁸⁹Social isolation was measured by three indicators: (1) reported loneliness, (2) reported ease of meeting neighbours, (3) proportion of friends who are neighbours.

⁹⁰Donald N. Rothblatt, "Housing and Human Needs." Town Planning Review Quarterly 42(2) (April 1971): 130-144.

⁹¹Family needs as defined by the study included the ease of supervision of children, mutually shared family activities and the participation of the husband in work activities within or near the house.

⁹²Esteem needs included the degree of pride in apartment, family status with respect to friends and relatives living outside the project.

buildings. He found very little social interaction (belongingness needs)⁹³ of project tenants with persons outside of the project or, indeed, beyond the building or residence.

The number of subjects studied in each project was less than 50, so that the findings suggest, at best, merely directional tendencies.

Low-Income Tenants and Satisfaction with Housing

In a random sample of 412 welfare recipients interviewed in New York in 1970, George S. Sternlieb and Bernard P. Indik⁹⁴ report that in response to the question, "How satisfied are you with the place you are living in now?" the percent responding dissatisfied was 23.5, very dissatisfied 16.3. A random sample of 423 residents of a community of mixed economic character, and included for comparative purposes, showed only 5.8% dissatisfied and 2.1% very dissatisfied.

In a measure of housing preferences of 231 low-income families in a southwestern American city of 250,000, J. Allen Williams, Jr.⁹⁵ found the order of preference to

⁹³Belongingness needs included making friendships with neighbours and the degree of participation in informal and formal groups.

⁹⁴George S. Sternlieb and Bernard P. Indik, The Ecology of Welfare: Housing and the Welfare Crisis in New York City (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1973), Chapter 5, pp. 99-131.

⁹⁵J. Allen Williams, Jr., "The Multi-Family Housing Solution and Housing Type Preferences," Social Science Quarterly 52(3) (December 1971): 543-559.

be: (1) single-family, (2) duplex, (3) town house, (4) four plex, (5) walk-up apartment and (6) high-rise. Approximately 94.5 percent of those interviewed indicated single-family housing as their first choice. Only 7.5 percent felt that high-rises would be acceptable for them. Housing characteristics considered important by those interviewed were: privacy, protection, outdoor space and the option to buy the dwelling unit.

A 1972 study by the City of Calgary Social Service Department⁹⁶ found that of 247 dwellings occupied by welfare recipients, 61.9% were found adequate by qualified building inspectors and 38.1% were substandard. Welfare tenants were concentrated in the city core and were not spread throughout the city. Regarding the attitudes of welfare recipients, the study found that most welfare recipients, whether in adequate or substandard housing, said that they would prefer to be in public housing.

Jack Levin and Gerald Taube⁹⁷ conducted a study of attitudes toward public housing among 560 tenants from twenty-five public housing projects in a large northeastern city in the United States. Male or female heads of households were interviewed regarding satisfaction with various

⁹⁶Davis Neave, "Housing of Welfare Recipients in Calgary: It Doesn't Look Like a \$1,000,000 Worth," Canadian Welfare 49(4) (July-August 1973): 9.

⁹⁷Jack Levin and Gerald Taube, "Attitudes Toward Public Housing Among Middle-Age Tenants," Sociological Symposium 3 (Fall 1969): 75-76.

aspects of public housing. Middle-aged tenants (40 to 60 years) were found to be more satisfied with public housing than either young adults (20 to 40 years) or elderly tenants (60 and over). Young adults were more likely to complain about public housing but were also more likely to participate in tenant councils. This group was also more likely to express a strong preference for home ownership.

Middle-aged tenants regarded project services superior to those available in private apartments. This group was also more likely to have made friends in their projects prior to tenancy.

A large number of the elderly perceived the projects as unsafe or dangerous.

Age differences in attitudes toward public housing were not affected by the degree of neighbourliness. Two variables diminished with age: the role of project borrowing and the role of expressed preference for home ownership.

In a study of public housing tenants, the findings of Gerald Taube and Jack Levin⁹⁸ show that tenants with friends both within and outside of their projects expressed greater satisfaction with public housing. Also, public housing tenants with memberships in voluntary associations

⁹⁸Gerald Taube and Jack Levin, "Public Housing as Neighbourhood: The Effect of Local and Non-Local Participation," Social Science Quarterly 53(3) (December 1971): 534.

in the wider community were more satisfied with public housing than non-members. Members of tenant councils showed more favourable attitudes toward their project neighbours.

In a study of factors facilitating adjustment to public housing following relocation from a slum clearance of Mexican American barrio families near El Paso, Texas, Ellwyn R. Stoddard⁹⁹ found that spatial distance to religious, shopping, recreational and occupational locations had no significant impact on adjustment scores. The only distance factor of significance was the distance from the local elementary school. The major concern expressed by the relocated families was for the preservation of the social relationships which existed in the barrio. These social relationships of visiting cliques among families emerged in the study as a major factor in family satisfaction with their new home and in adjustment to new surroundings.

In a study of rent subsidy and housing satisfaction among 160 negro families relocated as a result of urban renewal in Lubbock, Texas, by Charles K. Edgley et al.,¹⁰⁰ a correlation between dissatisfaction with housing and

⁹⁹Ellwyn R. Stoddard, "The Adjustment of Mexican American Barrio Families to Forced Housing Relocation," Social Science Quarterly 53(4) (March 1973): 749-759.

¹⁰⁰Charles K. Edgley, W. G. Steglich, and Walter J. Cartwright, "Rent Subsidy and Housing Satisfaction: The Case of Urban Renewal in Lubbock, Texas," The American Journal of Economics and Sociology 27(2) (April 1968): 113-123.

(1) amount of subsidy, (2) socioeconomic status, (3) number of persons in a dwelling unit, (4) number of children in a dwelling unit and (5) average monthly cost of utilities, an interesting finding was that the greater the subsidy paid by the government, the greater the dissatisfaction. However, since the lowest income families received the greatest subsidy, the dissatisfaction is probably related to a third variable such as poverty.

Public Housing--Social Isolation

Louis Kriesberg¹⁰¹ in a study of four public housing projects and the surrounding neighbourhoods in Syracuse, New York, found that residence in public housing does constitute a barrier to social interaction unless the project tenants are drawn from the surrounding neighbourhood and no major social differences exist between project tenants and neighbourhood tenants. In the projects studied, though they differed considerably in socioeconomic status with their surrounding neighbourhood, these differences did not prevent the establishing of neighbourly relations and even friendships. It would appear that the four public housing projects were not socially isolated from the surrounding neighbourhood in this study. Unfortunately, other factors

¹⁰¹Louis Kriesberg, "Neighbourhood Setting and the Isolation of Public Housing Tenants," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 34(1) (January 1968): 43-49.

such as perceived stigma are not measured or assessed. Also, greater socioeconomic differences between the project and its surrounding neighbourhood might have produced lower rates of social interaction.

In a 1971 national survey, Cantril and Roll¹⁰² found the American people personally content. By contrast, though using a similar measure, Sternlieb and Indik found that the New York City welfare recipients viewed their personal situation as negative.¹⁰³

Social Indicators and the Measure of Quality of Life

Social indicators have been defined variously as "measurements of social phenomena whose movements indicate whether a particular problem is getting better or worse, relative to some goal"¹⁰⁴ or as "providing a framework for evaluating social policies and programs in terms of their effectiveness in achieving these goals."¹⁰⁵ But, perhaps

¹⁰²Albert H. Cantril and Charles W. Roll, Hopes and Fears of the American People (New York: University Books, 1971).

¹⁰³See George S. Sternlieb & Bernard P. Indik, The Ecology of Welfare: Housing and the Welfare Crisis in New York City, Chapter 6.

¹⁰⁴Martin T. Katzman, "Some Indicators and Urban Public Policy," Planning (Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, eds., 1968).

¹⁰⁵Doris B. Holleb, "Social Statistics for Social Policy," Planning (Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, eds., 1968).

the best definition is offered by Raymond A. Bauer:

Social indicators are statistics, statistical series, and all other forms of evidence that enable us to assess where we stand and are going with respect to our values and goals, and to evaluate specific programs and to determine their impact.¹⁰⁶

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration initiated a study of the impact of the space program on society. On evaluating these efforts, it became necessary to develop measures of social change. This led to an increased interest in the development of social indicators.

One of the leading proponents of this study was Raymond A. Bauer who brought together a number of the leading social scientists in their field to discuss the development of the social indicators necessary for the study proposed for the Space Administration. The outcome of his efforts was the book, Social Indicators,¹⁰⁷ published in 1966.

This book is credited with giving impetus to the present Social Indicator movement. Because of the crucial role played by Raymond Bauer, he has come to be considered the father of the Social Indicator movement.

Though the Space Program gave impetus to the present enthusiasm for social indicators, the movement has earlier historical antecedents.

¹⁰⁶ Raymond A. Bauer, Social Indicators, ed. Raymond A. Bauer (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1966).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

In 1929, President Hoover commissioned a group of scientists to consider the feasibility of pursuing a national survey of social trends within the United States. The results were published in 1933 in a report called, "Recent Social Trends." This report called for an interdisciplinary involvement in assessing societal change. Its recommendations eventually led to the development of economic indicators which were the forerunners of social indicators.

President Eisenhower established a commission to develop a series of national goals. This commission produced the "Report of The President's Commission on National Goals," in 1960. It is interesting to note that of the 81 goals named in this report, investigators were able to find indicators for only 48. Thus, 33 had no relevant indicators. Statistics had not been developed to measure these 33 goals.¹⁰⁸

In 1966, President Johnson appointed a special team in the Health, Education and Welfare Department to develop social indicators to serve as the basis for social policy of the government. This team produced, "Toward a Social Report," in 1969.

¹⁰⁸ Albert D. Biderman, "Social Indicators and Goals," Social Indicators, ed. Raymond A. Bauer (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1966), p. 87.

Since the 1960's, the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (H.E.W.) has produced the annual HEW Trends and the monthly HEW Indicators.

In 1967, an act was proposed calling for the President to report to Congress on the social state of the nation annually as he must on the economic state of the Union. The bill was widely debated but it was not passed.

President Nixon appointed a committee to set a series of national goals and indicators for the American society. It gave one report before being disbanded in 1969.

On the international scene, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (O.E.C.D., which is an organization of 24 countries of the industrialized nations of Western Europe and includes Canada and the United States) has done much to develop social indicators.

This organization seeks to develop social indicators that would be agreed on by members to become aware of the relationship of economic growth with welfare in its fundamental sense. The general objectives of these indicators would be: (a) identifying the social demands, aspirations and problems of concern to the socioeconomic planning, (b) measuring and reporting change relative to their concerns, (c) better focusing and enlightening

public discussion and government decision-making.¹⁰⁹

O.E.C.D. has been able to draw up a list of social concerns agreed to by all the countries in the organization. This list was published in Paris in 1973 under the title, List of Social Concerns Common to Most Member Countries.

A working party on social indicators continues to work under the auspices of O.E.C.D. to develop social indicators to measure these concerns. These efforts are still under way.

The O.E.C.D. list does not go as far in subjective terms as some efforts in the United States, such as studies by Andrews and Withey. The list of social concerns defines well-being in the present tense. It stresses the individual, not society. This anchoring in the present, thus excludes issues regarding the future, such as society's responsibility to future generations.

In Canada, there has been much interest in the Social Indicator movement. Hans Adler, of the staff of Statistics Canada, speaking to a Seminar on Social Indicators in Ottawa in 1972, noted the desire of Statistics Canada "to provide a set of social and socioeconomic statistics which illustrate in broad strokes some salient

¹⁰⁹David E. Christian, "International Social Indicators: The O.E.C.D. Experience," Social Indicators Research, May, 1974, p. 169.

trends in Canadian society."¹¹⁰

Among the areas of concern to be included by its interdepartment committee on social indicators were: (1) population; (2) health; (3) education; (4) income and expenditures; (5) welfare and social security; (6) labour force and employment; (7) leisure, arts and culture; (8) justice; (9) housing; (10) environment and urban statistics; (11) social mobility.

Though recognizing the need for indicators of perceived quality of life, Adler introduced a note of hesitancy:

It has also become apparent that the only meaningful statistical answer which can be rendered for certain social concerns must be sought via attitude surveys. . . . Statistics Canada has not thoroughly considered that possibility.¹¹¹

Donna J. Merwin notes:

Social indicators, social reporting and quality of life are terms used synonymously to refer to an individual's social and psychological well-being. Objective social indicators refer to conditions external to the individual such as housing, transportation, police and fire protection. Perceptual indicators on the other hand, refer to an individual's psychological sense of well-being--his or her perception, frustration and satisfactions with the quality of his or her life.¹¹²

¹¹⁰Hans Adler, "Social Indicators Seminar," Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, January, 1972.

¹¹¹Ibid.

¹¹²Donna J. Merwin, Social Indicators and Societal Monitoring: An Annotated Bibliography, ed. Leslie D. Wilcox (Washington: Jussey-Bass, Inc., 1972).

Much of the work in social indicators has been in the area of subjective or perceptual indicators. This trend has been criticized by some. Frederick H. Buttel et al.¹¹³ observe that there is no high relationship noted between subjective and objective quality of life indicators. Many studies have failed to establish any correlation between objective and subjective indicators of the same area. Buttel's criticism is that quality of life indicators measure conservative political attitudes rather than the degree of satisfaction with the quality of life.

In pursuing social indicators of well-being, an effort is first made to determine the areas of concern that people have in their lives. Surveys are conducted to determine the areas of greatest concern. Using correlation techniques, researchers are able to isolate the major concerns of people. Independent studies by Andrews and Withey,¹¹⁴ as well as studies by Campbell and Converse,¹¹⁵ along with Robert Foster¹¹⁶ in the U.S.A., as well as a

¹¹³Frederick Buttel et al., "Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life," Social Indicators Research, July, 1977, p. 353.

¹¹⁴Frank Andrews, Social Indicators of Well-Being (New York: Plenum Press, 1976).

¹¹⁵Angus Campbell and Philip Converse, The Quality of American Life (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976).

¹¹⁶Robert Foster, "Economic and Quality of Life Factors in Industrial Location Decisions," Social Indicators Research, July, 1977, p. 247.

study by Knox¹¹⁷ in Great Britain have shown a remarkable similarity of common life concerns. Among the common concerns determined by these studies are: (1) health, (2) education, (3) housing, (4) government, (5) family, (6) marriage, (7) friends, (8) income, (9) job satisfaction, (10) leisure and recreation, (11) neighbourhood.

Once the concerns have been determined, a questionnaire using a Likert scale is developed to determine how subjects feel on various areas in their life. A typical question might be, "How do you feel about your neighbourhood? Very Good, Good, Neutral (neither bad nor good), Bad, Very Bad." The total on each of these items is found and this score is considered to be the quality of life score for the subject.

By the use of factor analysis of forty variables of well-being, Shirley S. Angrist¹¹⁸ concluded that five variables are important in measuring well-being in public housing projects at the local or neighbourhood level. These factors are: (1) the tenants' concern with their physical security, (2) livability of the project, (3) tenant identification with the project, (4) visiting patterns

¹¹⁷Paul L. Knox, Social Priorities for Social Indicators: A Survey Approach (Dundee, Scotland: University of Dundee, 1970).

¹¹⁸Shirley S. Angrist, "Dimensions of Well-Being in Public Housing Families," Environment and Behaviour 6(4) (December 1974): 495-516.

outside the project and (5) future aspirations.

In a study of 199 tenants living in 15 public housing projects in Kitchener, Guelph and Galt, Ontario, Adepoju G. Onibokun¹¹⁹ found a significant negative association between size of household and satisfaction with public housing. Divorced and separated women are more likely to express a lower degree of satisfaction with public housing than two-parent families. No significant association was found between age of tenants and relative satisfaction with public housing. A negative correlation was found for satisfaction with public housing and socioeconomic status, education, occupation and employment status. The length of stay in the present dwelling and the birthplace of the respondent were variables significantly associated with satisfaction with public housing. Respondents who moved from owner-occupied homes to public housing tended to be less satisfied with public housing than those who moved from rented homes. Those who moved from walk-up apartments or high-rise apartments to single-family units in public housing projects had a higher degree of satisfaction than those who moved from semi-detached or single-family units.

¹¹⁹Adepoju G. Onibokun, "Social System Correlates of Residential Satisfaction," Environment and Behaviour 8(3) (September 1976): 323-344.

CHAPTER VIII

SAMPLE SELECTION

A list of all tenants in Windsor participating in the Rent Supplement program was obtained. The list contained 72 family units and 170 senior units. All tenants were assigned a number and 30 subjects were selected from the family list and 30 subjects from the senior to obtain a total of 60 subjects from the Rent Supplement program, using a list of random numbers.¹²⁰

An agency list of tenants in Public Housing could not be obtained. The list of tenants in Public Housing was obtained by locating Public Housing projects through neighbourhood profiles developed by United Way of Windsor-Essex County, and by locating the names of the Public Housing tenants from the City Directory of Windsor.

A stratified random sample was obtained representing subjects from each of six Public Housing projects diversely located in Windsor. Windsor, a highly industrialized, medium-sized city of 202,000 people is located in Southwestern Ontario, Canada, across the Ambassador

¹²⁰R. A. Fisher and F. Yates, Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural and Medical Research (New York: Hafner Publishing Company, Inc., 1963).

Bridge from Detroit. It has six Public Housing projects.

The six projects are:

Essex Court, which consists of 207 Public Housing row units located between College Avenue, Barrymore and Prince Roads.

Ford-Ferndale, which opened in December, 1970 and consists of 220 family units located in the area bounded by South National Blvd. on the north, Lassaline Street on the south, Ferndale Avenue on the east and Ford Blvd. on the west.

Bloomfield-St. Joseph, which includes 169 Public Housing units on Bloomfield and St. Joseph Streets.

Fontainebleau, which was opened in 1971. It consists of 22 blocks of varying unit size (six to nine units per block) for a total of 175 row-type family units. Of these, 78 have two bedrooms, 89 have three bedrooms and eight have four bedrooms. The project population consists of 74% mother-led families. Senior citizens make up 11% of the population. The project is bounded by Rivard Park on the west, Grandview Road on the east and the north and Clarence Avenue on the south.

Curry-McKay, which consists of 200 one- and two-storey semi-detached units in the west end of Windsor. They were built in 1972.

Glengarry, which is bounded geographically by Riverside Drive on the north, Wyandotte Street on the south, Marentette Avenue on the east and McDougall Avenue on the west. It consists of 482 Public Housing rental units, four apartment buildings and 57 row houses. The population consists of 260 families and 217 seniors.

A total of 30 subjects were randomly selected from the list for each project in proportion to the number of units in the project, (see Table 1).

TABLE 1			
SUBJECTS SELECTED FROM EACH PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECT			
Public Housing Project	Number Of Units	% Of Project	Number Of Subjects Chosen
Essex Court	207	14%	8
Fontainebleau	175	12%	7
Bloomfield-St. Joseph	169	12%	7
Curry-McKay	200	14%	8
Ford-Ferndale	220	15%	9
Glengarry	482	33%	20
TOTAL	1,453	100%	59 + 1 = 60

The interviews were conducted by the writer, as well as two social workers who were about to enter graduate studies in social work at the University of Windsor.

A training session was conducted during which the nature of the research and the procedures to be followed in conducting the interviews were explained.

A letter was sent to each subject prior to the beginning of the interviews (see Appendix B). The interviews were conducted over a three-week period during the summer of 1979. A total of 46 interviews were completed, 22 in Rent Supplement and 24 in Public Housing. The Rent

Supplement sample consisted of 14 seniors and eight families. The Public Housing group consisted of seven seniors and 17 families.

The discussion of the sample will include a discussion of the total sample which consists of the 22 tenants in Rent Supplement and the 24 tenants in Public Housing, as well as two sub-groups: sub-group one consisting of eight families in Rent Supplement and 17 families in Public Housing, and sub-group two consisting of 14 seniors in Rent Supplement and seven seniors in Public Housing.

Sub-Group I--Family

There was no statistically significant difference between subjects in the Rent Supplement family group and the Public Housing family group as to marital status, age, sex, number of children, type of previous accommodation, time spent at the present address, education, source of income or amount of income. The only statistically significant difference between the two groups is that of being in public housing as opposed to private housing.

TABLE 2
SUB-GROUP I--FAMILY

Variables	Program	
	N = 8	Rent Supplement N = 17 Public Housing
Marital Status	Married	0 3
	Single	0 4
	Divorced	5 6
	Separated	1 2
	Common Law	0 0
	Widow	2 2
	Other	0 0
Age	Mean	35.6 years 35.529 years
	Median	30.0 34.000
	Mode	21 26.000
	Minimum	21 23
	Maximum	58 49
Sex	Male	0 1
	Female	8 15
		Missing Value 1
Number Of Children	Mean	1.50 1.882
	Median	1.10 1.813
	Mode	1.00 2.000
	Minimum	0
	Maximum	5
Previous Accommodation	Public Housing	1 Rent Supplement 2
	Private Rent	7 Public Housing 5 Own Home 1 Private Rent 9
Time At Present Address	Mean	3.000 years
	Median	3.556
	Mode	4.000
	Minimum	0
	Maximum	0
Time At Previous Address	Mean	2.25 years 3.294 years
	Median	1.50 2.200
	Mode	1.00 1.00
	Minimum	1.00 1.00
	Maximum	7.00 13.00

TABLE 2--Continued
SUB-GROUP I--FAMILY

Variables	Program	
	N = 8 Rent Supplement	N = 17 Public Housing
Education	Mean	9.375 years
	Median	10.833 completed
	Mode	11.000
	Minimum	5
	Maximum	13
Source Of Income	Wages	0
	Mother's Allowance	6
	Old Age Pension	1
	Disability Pension	0
	Pension	0
	Other	1
Monthly Income	Mean	\$322.25
	Median	339.00
	Mode	\$487.75
	Minimum	420.50
	Maximum	286.00

Sub-Group II--Seniors

The two groups, Rent Supplement seniors and Public Housing seniors, are not significantly different as to marital status, sex, and education. There is a significant difference between the two groups as to type of accommodation, age, time at present address and previous accommodation. Seniors in Public Housing, on the average, are older than Rent Supplement seniors, have spent a longer time at their present address, have had a different

previous accommodation and are living in public housing units rather than private units.

TABLE 3 SUB-GROUP II--SENIORS			
Variables	Program		
	N = 14	Rent Supplement	Public Housing
Marital Status	Single	2	1
	Widow	9	6
	Divorced	1	0
	Separated	2	0
Age	Mean	68.071 years	82.286 years
	Median	66.500	83.000
	Mode	62.000	67.000
	Minimum	62.000	67.000
	Maximum	80	96.000
Sex	Male	1	1
	Female	13	6
Time At Present Address	Mean	1.929 years	5.857 years
	Median	1.944	5.750
	Mode	2.0	2.000
	Minimum	1.0	2.000
	Maximum	3.0	14.000
Previous Accommodation	Rent Supplement	0	1
	Public Housing	0	2
	Own Home	3	1
	Private Rent	9	1
	Other	5	1
	Missing Value	0	1
Education	Mean	8.929 years	6.857 years
	Median	9.50 completed	8.000 completed
	Mode	12.000	8.000 completed
	Minimum	0	0
	Maximum	13	13

TABLE 3--Continued
SUB GROUP II--SENIORS

Variables	Program	
	N = 14 Rent Supplement	N = 7 Public Housing
Income	Mean	\$367.83
	Median	371.50
	Mode	400.00
	Minimum	232.00
	Maximum	560.00
Present Accommodation	Row Housing	0
	Public Housing	2
	Family	0
	Public Housing Senior	1
	Private Rent	4
	Other	0

See also Appendix C.

CHAPTER IX

HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis I - Tenants in the Rent Supplement program will show a higher degree of sociability (as measured by the number of people in the area known well enough to talk to, to visit in their homes, or to do things with; the frequency of contact with relatives, and the number of new friends made) than tenants in the Public Housing program.

Hypothesis II - Children in the Rent Supplement program will show a higher degree of sociability (as measured by their having a friend stay for dinner or having visited a friend's house within a one-month period) than children in Public Housing.

Hypothesis III-A - Tenants in the Rent Supplement program will have friends of higher socioeconomic status than do tenants of Public Housing.

Hypothesis III-B - Children in the Rent Supplement program will have friends of higher socioeconomic status than do children in Public Housing.

Hypothesis IV-A - Tenants in the Rent Supplement program will participate in more community activities and organizations than do tenants in Public Housing.

Hypothesis IV-B - Children in the Rent Supplement program will participate in more community activities and organizations than do children in Public Housing.

Hypothesis V-A - Tenants in Rent Supplement will show a higher rate of participation in activities since moving to their present address than tenants in Public Housing.

Hypothesis V-B - Children in Rent Supplement will show a higher rate of participation in activities since moving to their present address than children in Public Housing.

Hypothesis VI - Tenants in Rent Supplement will show a lower rate than Public Housing tenants of:

- A - Total Alienation
- B - Powerlessness
- C - Meaninglessness
- D - Normlessness
- E - Social Estrangement
- F - Social Isolation
- G - Estrangement From Work

Hypothesis VII - Tenants in Rent Supplement will report better physical health than do Public Housing tenants:

- A - For Themselves
- B - Their Children

Hypothesis VIII-A - Tenants in the Rent Supplement program will show a lower incidence of reported stigma than Public Housing.

Hypothesis VIII-B - There will be a lower incidence of stigma reported for children in Rent Supplement than for children in Public Housing.

Hypothesis IX - The Rent Supplement tenants will have a higher score of total psychological well-being than Public

Housing tenants.

Hypothesis X - The Rent Supplement program will have a lower rate of delinquency than the Public Housing program.

Hypothesis XI - The Rent Supplement tenants will show a higher total satisfaction (as measured by the sum of responses to all items in Section H) than do Public Housing tenants.

Hypothesis XII - The Rent Supplement tenants will show a higher score on overall Quality of Life (as measured by the sum of items 1 to 5, section A; all items of section B; the self health score of section C, items 1 to 10, and 16 to 26 less items 11 to 15, section C; less the total score of items in section D, section E, and section F) than Public Housing tenants.

Hypothesis XIII - The children in Rent Supplement will show a higher Quality of Life (as indicated by the sum of the sociability score for children, the number of activities engaged in since moving to the present address, the physical health score less the delinquency and stigma reported) than do children in Public Housing.

CHAPTER X

FINDINGS

PART I: Tenants in Rent Supplement and Public Housing Compared

Sociability

In Section A, questions 1 to 5 of the questionnaire were designed to measure social interaction by soliciting the number of new friends made, the number of people known on a speaking basis, the number of people close enough to visit in their homes, the frequency of activities undertaken with neighbours and the amount of contact with relatives. The cumulative total of these responses is referred to as the variable "sociability." Though the Rent Supplement group had a lower mean score (48.3182) on this variable than the Public Housing group (63.7917), the difference was not significantly different. $T = -0.63$ df 44 $P > .05$.

Sociability of Children

The variable "sociability of children" was designed to measure the extent of social interaction of children with neighbours. It was evaluated by determining whether or not children had friends over for dinner or had visited in the homes of friends within a one-month period. 'Yes' was scored 2 and 'No' 1. Children in the Rent Supplement

program scored a higher mean (3.6250) than did children in Public Housing (3.4667). However, the difference was not statistically significant. $T = .60$ $df\ 21$ $P > .05$.

Education and Wealth of Friends

The Rent Supplement and the Public Housing groups were asked to indicate if the education and the wealth of their friends were less than equal to or greater than their own. The scores assigned to responses were 1, 2, 3, respectively. These variables called "Education of Friends" and "Wealth of Friends" were designed to measure if either group had social contact with members of higher socioeconomic status groups. On both measures the Rent Supplement group indicated more contact with higher status friends than did the Public Housing group. Differences between the groups were statistically significant.

TABLE 4				
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF TENANTS' FRIENDS				
Variables	Program	Mean	t	df
Education of Friends	Rent Supplement	2.4091	2.21	44*
	Public Housing	2.0000		
Wealth of Friends	Rent Supplement	2.7273	3.60	44**
	Public Housing	2.2500		

* $P < .05$

** $P = .001$

Education and Wealth of Friends of Children

Both groups were asked to rate the friends of their children as being from families poorer, the same, or more wealthy than themselves. The mean for Rent Supplement children was 2.1250 and for Public Housing children it was 2.0000. The difference was not significant. $T = .59$ $df = 21$ $P > .05$.

Where Friends Live

Both groups were asked to indicate where most of their friends lived. Table 5 indicates the response to this question.

TABLE 5 ACCOMMODATIONS OF TENANTS' FRIENDS						
Programs	Where Friends Live					
	Public Housing	Apartment With Government Assistance For Rent	Apartment With No Government Assistance For Rent	Own Home	Don't Know	Other
Public Housing	3	7	10	2	1	1
Rent Supplement	1	0	16	3	2	0

Chi-Square = 10.85150 $df = 5$ $P = .05$

Cramer's V = .4857

As can be seen in Table 5, there is a relationship between the groups and where most of their friends live. Cramer V indicates that the strength of their relationship is moderate. Members of the Rent Supplement group seem more likely to have friends who are independent of government assistance.

Community Participation

Community participation was determined by scoring a point for each recreational activity attended and for each organization or club membership. Additional points were scored for executive positions held, as well as for the number of meetings attended each month. Community participation was very low in both groups. However, Public Housing tenants, on the average, participated more often with a group mean of 3.000 to a mean of 2.000 by members of the Rent Supplement program. The differences were not statistically significant. $T = -.84$ $df = 44$ $P > .05$.

Church Attendance

Those in Rent Supplement, on the average, attended church more than did those in Public Housing. The mean differences were not, however, significantly different. The Rent Supplement mean was 1.5455; the Public Housing group mean was 1.3333. $T = 1.45$ $df = 44$ $P > .05$.

Children's Activities

There was a statistically significant difference in the number of activities by children in the two groups. Children in Public Housing were more active with a mean score of 2.000 to a mean score of .3750 in the Rent Supplement program. A separate variance estimate shows $T = 3.03$ $df = 20.21$ $P < .005$ for a one tailed test.

Activities At New Address

The adults in Rent Supplement showed a slightly higher mean as a group regarding activities since they moved to their present address than did adults in Public Housing. There is a high probability, however, that these differences were due to chance. The T value for 44 df was .18 with a probability of .859.

Children's Activities At New Address

Children in Public Housing showed a higher participation rate since moving to their present address than did those in the Rent Supplement group.

Children in Rent Supplement	mean 2.5000
Children in Public Housing	mean 3.4667

$T = -1.50$ $df 9.25$ $P > .05$. The difference in the two groups is not statistically different for a one tailed test.

Alienation

Alienation was measured by a modification of Russell Middleton's scale which assesses five areas of alienation:

powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, social estrangement and estrangement from work.¹²¹

There was no significant difference between the two groups on the total alienation score. However, there were significant differences between the Rent Supplement group and Public Housing group on the specific items of powerlessness and alienation from work, as shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6 ALIENATION					
Type Of Alienation	Measuring Item On Questionnaire	Program	Mean	t	df
Powerlessness	Item 1, Section D	Rent Supplement	1.8095	2.23	43*
		Public Housing	1.5000		
Estrangement From Work	Item 6, Section D	Rent Supplement	1.1818	-3.71	44**
		Public Housing	1.6667		

* P = .03

** P = .001

Table 6 illustrates that the Rent Supplement group shows a higher degree of powerlessness, while the Public

¹²¹Russell Middleton, "Alienation, Race, and Education," American Sociological Review 28 (December 1963): 973-977.

Housing group demonstrates a higher degree of alienation from the work that they must do.

Religious Fulfillment

A test of Chi square shows that a relationship exists between the housing program and satisfaction with religious fulfillment in life. Chi square = 14.67738
df = 16 significant at .02 level. Cramer's V with a value of .564 would indicate that the strength of the relationship is moderate.

Stigma

There was no significant difference between the two groups on reported stigma. The group mean for Rent Supplement was 4.9545; for Public Housing, mean = 5.2917.

$T = -.71$ $df = 44$ $P > .05$.

Stigma Toward Children

The Public Housing group reported a stigma rate for children higher than did the Rent Supplement group, significant at .05 level for a one tailed test.

Psychological Well-Being

There were no significant differences between the two groups on total psychological well-being which is the cumulative total for all items in Section G.

However, the groups were significantly different on two individual items in Section G, namely, question 8,

items 8 and 9, indicating that the Rent Supplement group felt more free and less tied down than did Public Housing tenants and found life more rewarding and less disappointing. $P < .05$ for a one tailed test of significance.

Delinquency

There was only one incident of delinquency reported by the 46 subjects. One Public Housing tenant reported that school officials contacted her regarding the behaviour of one of her children at school. In effect, there was no delinquency reported in either the Rent Supplement or the Public Housing program.

Total Satisfaction

There was no significant difference between the two groups on the variable "total satisfaction" which was calculated by adding the values of all responses in Section H. However, the score for a two tailed test demonstrates that there was a significant difference between the two groups on items 1, 5, 10, 14. In each case $P < .05$ (for item 14, $P = .000$).

This demonstrates that the Rent Supplement group, relative to the Public Housing group, was more satisfied with the daily activities that had to be done, more satisfied with their family life and more satisfied with the program they were in; that is to say, tenants expressed higher satisfaction with the Rent Supplement program than

did tenants in Public Housing. On this variable the T value was 2.29 df = 44 P = .000. Chi square 14.67338 df = 16 P = 0.02. There was a moderately strong association between program and satisfaction with program. Cramer V = .56.

Citizens' Groups

Items 1 and 2 in Section I show statistically significant differences between the two groups. Tenants in Public Housing were more likely to have participated in or presently belong to citizens' groups than were Rent Supplement tenants. $P < .05$ for a one tailed test.

Physical Health

There were no significant differences between the Rent Supplement and the Public Housing groups for children or adults on reported physical health. (See questionnaire Appendix A, Section C.)

However, the Public Housing group expressed higher satisfaction with the state of their health, (item 1, Section H). $T = -1.97$ df = 44 $P < .05$ for a one tailed test.

Quality of Life

The Quality of Life score was obtained from the cumulative total of all items 1 to 5 in Section A, all items in Section B, the total health score of Section C; all items in Section G were totaled except item 7-which represented a negation of well-being. These were subtracted from the

total. The total scores for stigma, alienation and delinquency were also subtracted. It was felt that the obtained total would reflect the degree of sociability and community participation, the physical health, psychological well-being and the degree of satisfaction with key life areas and would account for such negative factors as stigma, alienation, delinquency and negative psychological experiences. In short, the total then obtained might be considered a reflection of the overall quality of life of each client. The two groups, Rent Supplement and Public Housing, were not found to differ significantly on this variable, though the mean quality of life score was higher for Public Housing tenants (224.45) than for Rent Supplement tenants (215.04).

Children's Quality of Life

The Quality of Life for children in the two groups was determined by adding the sociability score for children, the number of activities engaged in since moving to the present address, the physical health score, minus the delinquency, and stigma reported.

On this measure, there was a statistically significant difference between children in the two programs. Children in the Rent Supplement program had a mean quality of life score of 67.5 while children in Public Housing showed a mean of 45.3. The difference is significant at the .05 level of significance for a one tailed test,

$T = 1.77 \quad df = 44.$

(a) Families in Rent Supplement and Public Housing
Findings

An analysis of data for the family groups in the Rent Supplement and Public Housing groups was conducted using the S.P.S.S. computer program. Only subjects under 59, as opposed to seniors at 60 and over, were considered for the study.

The family groups in the two programs differed significantly on several variables.

Tenants in Rent Supplement have contact with friends of higher wealth than do tenants in Public Housing. The group mean for Rent Supplement is 2.8750 and for Public Housing it is 2.2353. $T = 3.61 \quad df = 23 \quad P = .001.$

The activities for the tenants and their children were less since moving to their present address for those in Rent Supplement than for tenants and their children in Public Housing. The mean for tenants in Rent Supplement was .6250 and for children .4286, compared to 2.9412 for tenants and 2.000 for children in Public Housing. The T values were -2.47 for tenants and -2.83 for children, $P < .05$ in both cases. Children experienced less stigma in the Rent Supplement program.

Psychological Well-Being

Tenants in Rent Supplement found their life less full than did tenants in Public Housing. However, Rent

Supplement tenants felt less tied down than did Public Housing tenants.

Satisfaction

Rent Supplement tenants were more satisfied with the program than were those in Public Housing. However, Public Housing tenants were more satisfied with the state of their health.

Participation in Citizens' Groups

Family tenants in Public Housing reported a much higher membership and participation in citizens' groups than did family tenants in Rent Supplement.

(b) Seniors in Rent Supplement and Public Housing

Findings

Seniors in Rent Supplement and Public Housing showed a statistically significant difference in where their friends lived. Public Housing seniors had more friends in Public Housing than did Rent Supplement seniors. Rent Supplement seniors had more friends in the Rent Supplement or who were able to pay their rent without government help.

Health and Psychological Well-Being

Seniors in Rent Supplement reported better physical health, though they saw their present life at a lower level than did Public Housing seniors. Public Housing seniors reported a higher incidence of negative psychological

experiences than did seniors in the Rent Supplement program.

Religious Fulfillment

A test of chi square indicates a relationship between programs and the degree of religious fulfillment. Chi square = 13.53409 with df at 4, significance = .0089. Cramer's V with a value of 0.80 indicates the relationship is a strong one. (See Table 7.)

TABLE 7 RELIGIOUS FULFILLMENT FOR SENIOR CITIZENS					
Programs	Religious Fulfillment in Life of Seniors				
	Somewhat Dissatis- fied	Mixed	Somewhat Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Public Housing	0	0	3	3	1
Rent Supple- ment	2	1	0	1	10

Chi square = 13.53409 df = 4 significance = .0089

Cramer's V = 0.80

A profile of a tenant in the Rent Supplement program based the higher mean score of the group on a variable (see Table 8), but without regard for statistically significant differences between groups it would suggest that tenants in the Rent Supplement program have contact with friends who

are wealthier and better educated. They participate in less activities. Rent Supplement tenants are happier, find life more interesting, enjoyable, worthwhile and easy, and life brings out the best in them. They tend to be more satisfied with government, churches and organizations. They are more satisfied with their family life and their friends, and more satisfied with their apartment and the Rent Supplement program they are in. Their children tend to be in better physical health and to socialize with friends who are of a higher socioeconomic level than their own.

A similar profile of the typical tenant in the Public Housing program, based on the relative size of the group means without regard for the statistically significant differences between the two groups, would indicate that a Public Housing tenant has more social contacts with neighbours, friends and relatives and takes part in more organizations and activities in general, and citizens' groups in particular. She experiences more alienation, and both she and her children experience stigma because they are in Public Housing. She considers her life--past, present, and future--with greater optimism. She sustains more psychologically lifting experiences, as well as more psychologically deflating experiences, in her daily life. She feels less lonely and feels her life is less empty and dissatisfying. She is more satisfied with her marital

status, her income and her religious fulfillment. Her children also participate in more activities.

TABLE 8 THE HIGHER MEAN SCORE FOR EACH VARIABLE	
Variables With A Higher Group Mean By Tenants In Rent Supplement	Variables With A Higher Group Mean By Tenants In Public Housing
Sociability of Children Education of Friends * Wealth of Friends * Socioeconomic Status of Children's Friends Church Attendance Activities since moving to present address Health of Children Happiness Powerlessness * Amount of Worrying Finds Life Interesting Satisfaction With Friends Satisfaction With Family Life * Satisfaction With Organizations Finds Life Enjoyable Finds Life Hard Finds Life Worthwhile Finds Life Hopeful Feels Free And Not Tied Down * Life Brings Out The Best In Me	Sociability (of the Tenant) Activities of Children since moving to present address * Child's Activities Health (of Tenant) Health (of Spouse) Alienation * Estrangement From Work Stigma (Tenant) * Children's Quality of Life Stigma (Spouse) Stigma (Child) Best Life Now Best Life In The Past Best Life In The Future Good Psychological Experiences * Participation In Citizens' Groups Bad Psychological Experiences Life More Friendly, Less Lonely Life Is Full, Not Empty * Life Is Rewarding

TABLE 8--Continued	
THE HIGHER MEAN SCORE FOR EACH VARIABLE	
Variables With A Higher Group Mean By Tenants In Rent Supplement	Variables With A Higher Group Mean By Tenants In Public Housing
Satisfaction With Apartment Satisfaction With Windsor As A Place To Live Satisfaction With Work * Satisfaction With Hobbies Satisfaction With Church Organizations Satisfaction With Program (Rent Supplement)* Overall Satisfaction A	Overall Satisfaction B Satisfaction With Health Satisfaction With Marital Status * Satisfaction With Religious Fulfillment Satisfaction With Money

* An asterisk indicates that a significant difference exists between the two groups at a .05 level for a one tailed test.

CHAPTER XI

FINDINGS

PART II: Correlations Between Variables

The data was analyzed using Pearson's correlation. The variable, "source of income," showed a correlation at a .05 level of significance or lower with a host of other variables. A low to moderate correlation (from .25 to .60) as measured by Pearson's correlation was indicated with all items in Section G except item 5, "life as it will be 5 years from now," item 13, "life as full as opposed to empty." A low to moderate correlation was found to exist between source of income and all items in Section H. These correlations would suggest that there is a definite relationship between source of income and psychological well-being, as well as over-all satisfaction.

Correlations were also found to exist between source of income and stigma, alienation, sociability of tenants, sociability of children, the number of activities that children take part in, and church attendance. Another factor of importance was the number of children. This factor was correlated with a host of other variables. It correlated positively with sociability of tenants, alienation, stigma,

negative psychological experiences; and negatively with church attendance, happiness, life as it is now, life as interesting, life as enjoyable, life as easy, life as worthwhile.

The amount of income showed a correlation with only sociability of children, health, tied-down--free, and satisfaction with program; suggesting that the source of the income was a more important factor regarding over-all satisfaction and well-being than was the amount of the income.

No correlation was found to exist between alienation and residents in an apartment high-rise.

Subjects were asked, on two occasions during the interview, how satisfied they were over all with their life as a test of internal validity of the questionnaire. The Pearson's correlation between over-all satisfaction A and over-all satisfaction B is $r = .6408$ $p = .000$.

The data indicates that a low negative correlation exists between physical health and age; a low positive correlation between health and income. A moderate negative correlation exists between the variables: age of parent and reported physical health of children. A moderate negative correlation exists between alienation and age which indicates that younger people in the sample show higher alienation than do the older tenants.

A moderate positive correlation was also found to exist between marital status and activities since moving to present address, and marital status and church attendance, as well as age and church attendance.

The housing program was correlated with education of friends, wealth of friends, where friends live, the number of children's activities, stigma experienced by children. The program showed fewer correlations with items indicating psychological well-being and satisfaction than did source of income. This suggests that being in Public Housing or in Rent Supplement may have less effect on over-all satisfaction, psychological well-being and quality of life, than being on Mother's Allowance. However, the program does seem to have a bearing on over-all social integration.

TABLE 9 PEARSON CORRELATION			
	Age	Number of Children	Income
Alienation	-0.2516 p = .046	.2449 p = .05	No Correla- tion

TABLE 10 PEARSON CORRELATION			
	Age	Income	Time At Present Address
Health	-.2417 p = .05	.2548 p = .05	-.2412 p = .05

TABLE 11 PEARSON CORRELATION	
	Age Of Parent
Health of Children	-.3449 p = .05

TABLE 12 PEARSON CORRELATION		
	Age	Number Of Children
Stigma	-.2728 p = .03	.3563 p = .008

TABLE 13 PEARSON CORRELATION			
	Accommodation	Marital Status	Number Of Children
Happiness	.4815 p = .001	.2676 p = .03	-.2618 p = .04

TABLE 14 PEARSON CORRELATION		
	Number of Children	Time At Present Address
Sociability	.4191 p = .002	.3361 p = .01

TABLE 15 PEARSON CORRELATION		
	Marital Status Of Parent	Income
Sociability of Children	.5406 p = .004	-.5355 p = .006

TABLE 16 PEARSON CORRELATION	
	Program
Number of Activities Children Take Part In	-.4652 * p = .013

* Rent Supplement was given a value of 2, Public Housing a value of 1. The negative correlation suggests that Public Housing is associated with higher activity for participation for children. This point was also supported by the t test. (See Children's Activities, p. 93.)

TABLE 17 PEARSON CORRELATION				
	Alienation	Happiness	Tied-down Free	Disappointing Rewarding
Source of Income	-.3980 * p = .003	-.4144 p = .002	.32 p = .01	.50 p = 0

* Mother's Allowance were given a value of 1, Disability 2, General Welfare 3, Old Age 4, Wages 5, Other 6. Thus, the negative correlation suggests that lower values, such as Mother's Allowance, show higher alienation than those on Old Age Pension or earning wages.

TABLE 18
PEARSON CORRELATION

	Life Brings Out Best In Me	Satis- faction With Income	Over-all Satis- faction	Satis- faction With Health	Satis- faction With Marital Status
Source of Income	.4024 p = .003	.7083 p = .000	0.5916 p = .000	.23 p = .05	.26 p = .03

TABLE 19
PEARSON CORRELATION

	Number Of Children
Satisfaction With Income	-.4939 p = .000

CHAPTER XII

CONCLUSIONS

Hypothesis I

The Rent Supplement group actually has a lower mean on sociability than does the Public Housing group, although the difference is not statistically significant. Hypothesis I is not supported by the findings and must be rejected.

Hypothesis II

Though children in the Rent Supplement program scored higher on sociability than did children in Public Housing, the difference was not statistically significant. Therefore, Hypothesis II must be rejected.

Hypothesis III-A

Friends of tenants in Rent Supplement were more often reported wealthier and better educated than the tenants themselves. Differences between the Rent Supplement group and the Public Housing group were significantly different at the .05 level. Hypothesis III-A is supported by the findings.

Hypothesis III-B

Though children in Rent Supplement showed a higher contact with children of higher socioeconomic status, the

difference between this group and children in Public Housing was not significantly different. Hypothesis III-B is not supported by the findings.

Hypothesis IV-A

There is no significant difference between the two groups regarding community participation. Actually, the group mean for Public Housing is higher. Hypothesis IV-A must be rejected.

Hypothesis IV-B

Actually, children in Public Housing participate in more community activities. The difference between the groups is significant at .005 level. Hypothesis VI-B is not supported by the findings and must be rejected.

Hypothesis V-A

Public Housing tenants participated more often than those in the Rent Supplement program. However, differences were not statistically different. Nevertheless, Hypothesis V-A is not supported by the findings and must be rejected.

Hypothesis V-B

Actually, children in Public Housing participated in more activities than did children in Rent Supplement.

$T = 3.03$ $df = 20.21$ $p < .005$. Thus, Hypothesis V-B is not supported by the findings and must be rejected.

Hypothesis VI (see Table 6)

There was no significant difference between the two groups in total alienation, powerlessness, meaninglessness,

normlessness, cultural estrangement and social isolation. Therefore, Hypotheses VI-A, C, D, E, F must be rejected.

The Rent Supplement group showed a significantly higher rate of powerlessness than did the Public Housing group. Therefore, Hypothesis VI-B must be rejected.

The degree of estrangement from work is significantly different and in the predicted direction. Hypothesis VI-G is supported by this study.

Hypotheses VII-A & B

There were no significant differences between the Rent Supplement and Public Housing groups for children or adults regarding physical health. Therefore, Hypotheses VII-A and VII-B are not supported by the findings and must be rejected.

Hypotheses VIII-A & B

Though tenants in the Rent Supplement group reported a lower incidence of stigma than did tenants in Public Housing, the differences were not statistically significant at .05 level or less. Therefore, Hypothesis VIII-A must be rejected.

A statistically significant difference in stigma was found in the predicted direction for children. $T = 2.65$, $df = 14$, $p = .019$. Hypothesis VIII-B is supported by the findings.

Hypothesis IX

There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups on the variable: total psychological.

well-being. Hypothesis IX is not supported by the findings and must be rejected.

Hypothesis X

There was not enough data obtained on the incidence of delinquency to reach any conclusions. Only one incident of delinquency was reported. One subject reported that she had received a note from the school indicating that one of her children was a behavioural problem at school. No cases of difficulty with police or appearances in juvenile court were reported.

Hypothesis XI

There was no significant difference between the two groups on the variable: total satisfaction. Therefore, Hypothesis XI must be rejected.

Hypothesis XII

Actually, the Public Housing group showed a higher over-all Quality of Life score than did the Rent Supplement group. However, there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups. Therefore, Hypothesis XII must be rejected.

Hypothesis XIII

Children in the Rent Supplement program had a mean Quality of Life score of 67.5 while children in Public Housing showed a mean of 45.3. The difference is significant at the .05 level for a one tailed test. Hypothesis XIII is supported by the findings of this study.

CHAPTER XIII

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of Joe R. Feagin et al.¹²² suggested an increase in sociability as indicated by an increase in talking with neighbours by tenants in Rent Supplement and a decrease in these activities by tenants in Public Housing. Our study found the Public Housing group to have a higher rate of sociability than Rent Supplement tenants though the differences between the two groups were not statistically significant. However, it should be noted that our measure of sociability included somewhat different factors such as new friends made, people known on a speaking basis, number of people close enough to visit, number of people to do things with and contact with relatives.

Feagin et al. found Public Housing tenants more likely to express dissatisfaction than were tenants in the Rent Supplement program. Our study found no significant differences between the two groups on total satisfaction; however, the Rent Supplement group had a statistically significant higher rate of satisfaction with their housing program than did tenants in Public Housing.

¹²² Joe R. Feagin, Charles Tilly & Constance W. Williams, Subsidizing the Poor: A Boston Housing Experiment.

Larry D. Barrett¹²³ found education influenced the degree of anomie (alienation) in a study of women in a low-income housing project. The present study found no correlation between the level of education and alienation. Unlike the findings of Daniel J. Amick and Frederick J. Kviz,¹²⁴ the present study found no correlation between alienation of tenants and dwelling in a Public Housing high-rise.

A. G. Onibokun¹²⁵ reports that low-income people in private rental projects did not encounter the problem of stigma though tenants in Public Housing did. The present study found that the Public Housing group reported a higher rate of stigma though the differences between the two groups were not statistically different. There was, however, a statistically significant higher rate of stigma for children in Public Housing than for children in the Rent Supplement program.

Charles K. Edgley et al.¹²⁶ found a correlation between dissatisfaction with housing and income and number of

¹²³Larry D. Barrett, "Achievement Values and Anomie Among Women in a Low-Income Housing Project," Social Forces 49 (September 1970): 127-134.

¹²⁴Daniel J. Amick and Frederick J. Kviz, "Density, Building Type and Social Integration in Public Housing Projects," Man--Environment Systems (May 1974): 187-190.

¹²⁵Adepoju G. Onibokun, Research, Environment and Planning 5(4) (1973): 471.

¹²⁶Charles K. Edgley, W. G. Steglich, and Walter J. Cartwright, "Rent Subsidy and Housing Satisfaction: The Case of Urban Renewal in Lubbock, Texas," The American Journal of Economics and Sociology 27(2) (April 1968): 113-123.

children in a dwelling unit. The present study found a correlation between source of income and alienation, as well as a correlation between stigma and number of children.

One of the major limitations of the study was the small sample size. A larger study should be undertaken to include a much larger number of subjects. The inclusion of subjects from other cities comparable to Windsor would be helpful. This would facilitate a comparison of the response of tenants in other areas with similar responses in Windsor.

The questionnaire used in this study to develop an over-all quality of life score was based on life concerns obtained from studies of the American population at large. Two limitations are suggested as a result: (1) Americans and Canadians may differ significantly on the relative importance of various life concerns, and (2) low income persons in social housing programs may have unique and peculiar concerns not detected in general population studies.

The questionnaire solicited objective data by means of a closed question structure. More open-ended questions would have offered tenants a greater opportunity to express their special concerns and satisfactions with their life. Many of the tenants interviewed were eager to make their opinions known. It is evident that procedures should be developed to afford tenants in Public Housing and Rent Supplement programs an opportunity to provide input into the operation of these programs.

No effort was made in this study to allow for the effects of methods, either formal or informal, by which clients are selected for the Rent Supplement program. It is possible that this selection process may result in persons with certain common attitudes or characteristics being placed in the Rent Supplement program.

Also, this study did not include those individuals or families of low income living in inadequate housing in the private sector. It is this omission that may in the final analysis be the greatest limitation of this present study. The special difficulties and needs of this group are great. They warrant a special study. For it is this impoverished group more than any other that challenges the effectiveness of our present housing programs.

As the sample is small, one must be cautious in applying the findings to the larger population. However, the findings of this study would cast doubts on some widely held concepts by proponents and opponents of the Public Housing and Rent Supplement programs. The findings would indicate that both programs have areas of merit, as well as certain definite limitations. The extreme position that Public Housing is without merit and should be abolished is not a tenable position and is to be avoided. So, also, is the position that the Rent Supplement program is the answer to all the difficulties of providing adequate housing for the poor.

The study shows that those in the Rent Supplement group express greater satisfaction with the program than do tenants in Public Housing. A more specific study should be done to explore the sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

The findings of this research would indicate that children are affected by the type of housing program they are in. The Rent Supplement program seems to reduce their stigma and to provide them with a higher quality of life. The Public Housing program, on the other hand, seems to encourage more social and recreational participation by children.

The fact that source of income shows more correlation to stigma, alienation, sociability and participation than does the type of housing program, suggests that efforts to reduce such negative effects as alienation and stigma might require an examination of the source of income of the poor. Perhaps changes in the system of transfer payments would be as necessary as changes in the housing program.

In view of the much greater contact in Windsor with citizens' groups by the Public Housing group and the wider participation in community activities by children of Public Housing tenants, further study would be indicated to determine the role being played by citizens' groups in Windsor, in providing activities for children, and how the efforts

of citizens' groups might be extended to assist children in the Rent Supplement program.

A higher rate of perceived powerlessness by those in the Rent Supplement program should be explored further. This might suggest difficulties and frustrations by these tenants in their efforts to cope in a neighbourhood of higher socioeconomic status. If so, this would be a difficulty that should be addressed by those implementing this program.

The measuring of perceived quality of life would appear to offer a means of evaluating housing programs. This study would indicate the need for further refining of the measuring instrument so that it is more finely tuned to qualities in the housing environment. However, these limitations, notwithstanding, the Rent Supplement program seems to offer a higher quality of life particularly for children than does Public Housing.

The study suggests that the type of housing program seems to have less effect on over-all satisfaction and psychological well-being than does the source of income. However, the type of housing program does seem related to over-all social integration.

The problem of providing adequate housing for the poor is complex. Solutions are elusive. Much remains to be done.

There are few fields of study where such tenacious convictions are held, unsubstantiated by even a minimum of

research, than, is the case in social housing. Much more research is required to provide the information for wise decision making regarding housing programs. Certainly, information available at the present time does not justify the discontinuation of Public Housing nor the unqualified endorsement of the Rent Supplement program.

APPENDIX A.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE:

Interviewer's Introduction
Before Beginning The Interview

(My name is _____ I am collecting information to be used in a Master of Social Work thesis. I would like to ask you some questions about the things you do and how satisfied you feel.

There are no correct answers to these questions. It is important that you give answers that indicate how you feel about the subject and what is correct for you.

I promise you that any information you give me will be kept in complete confidence. Your name will not be used or connected, in any way, with the information that you give.

All information will be very important for our research.)

GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of Program (Public Housing or Rent Supplement):

Type of Accommodation:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| a) Public Housing Row Houses | d) Private High Rise |
| b) Public Housing High Rise (Family) | e) Other (Specify) |
| c) Public Housing High Rise (Senior) | |

Address:

Marital Status:

Age:

Sex:

Number and Age of Children Still Living at Home:

Length of Time at Present Address:

Previous Address:

Previous Accommodation:

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| a) Rent Supplement | d) Private Rent |
| b) Public Housing | e) Other (Specify) |
| c) Own Home | |

Length of Time at Previous Address:

Education (What was the last grade in school completed?):

Total Monthly Income (amount):

Source of Income:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| a) Mother's Allowance | d) Old Age Pension |
| b) Disability Pension | e) Wages |
| c) General Welfare | f) Other (Specify) |

SECTION A

(Items 1 to 5 measure Sociability)

1. How many people in this area do you know well enough to stop and talk to?

NUMBER _____

2. How many new friends, would you say, that you have made since you moved to this apartment?

NUMBER _____

3. How often, would you say, that you get together with relatives? (Parents, Brothers, Sisters)
1. NEVER 2. NOT VERY OFTEN 3. OFTEN 4. VERY OFTEN

4. How many people in this area do you know well enough to visit in their homes?

NUMBER _____

5. How often, would you say, that you visit, go places with, or do things with neighbours in this area?
1. NEVER 2. NOT VERY OFTEN 3. OFTEN 4. VERY OFTEN

(Items 6 & 7 measure Sociability of Children)

6. In the last month has one of your children had a friend stay at your place for dinner?

YES

NO

DOES NOT APPLY

7. In the last month has one of your children visited the home of a friend?

YES

NO

DOES NOT APPLY

8. How would you rate the education of most of your friends?

1. LESS THAN YOURS
3. MORE THAN YOURS

2. ABOUT THE SAME AS YOURS

9. How would you rate the wealth of most of your friends? Compared to your own, would you say their income is,

1. LESS THAN YOURS 2. ABOUT THE SAME AS YOURS
3. GREATER THAN YOURS

10. Considering the children that your children play with, would you say these children come from families,

1. POORER THAN YOU 2. THE SAME AS YOU
3. MORE WEALTHY THAN YOU 4. DOES NOT APPLY

11. Think of all your friends and all the people you know, either to speak to or to visit, would you say,
- a) MOST LIVE IN PUBLIC HOUSING
 - b) MOST LIVE IN PRIVATE APARTMENTS AND GET HELP FROM THE GOVERNMENT TO PAY THEIR RENT
 - c) MOST OWN THEIR OWN HOMES
 - d) MOST PAY THEIR OWN RENT WITHOUT HELP FROM THE GOVERNMENT
 - e) DON'T KNOW
 - f) OTHER (SPECIFY)

SECTION B

(Community Activities)

1. How many times in the last month have you attended some entertainment or recreational activity in the community?
NUMBER OF TIMES _____
2. Are you a member of any club or organization (such as lodge, church group, union, hobby or crafts club, senior citizens' group, parent-teacher group, legion)?
YES NO
3. Please name the clubs or organizations to which you belong.
4. Do you hold any position in these clubs or organizations such as President, Vice-President, Secretary or Treasurer?
YES NO
5. Have you attended a meeting in the last month of the clubs or organizations? How many meetings have you attended?
NUMBER _____

NAME OF CLUB OR ORGANIZATION	POSITION HELD	NUMBER OF MEETINGS ATTENDED IN LAST MONTH

6. Have you attended church services in the last month?

YES

NO

(Community Activities of Children)

(Items 7 & 8)

7. Do your children take part in any organized activities in the community other than those held at school?

YES

NO

8. Please name these activities.

9. How would you compare the number of activities that you take part in since you moved to this address, compared to the number of activities that you took part in where you lived before? Would you say that now you take part in,

1. FAR FEWER ACTIVITIES

2. FEW ACTIVITIES

3. ABOUT THE SAME NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES

4. MORE ACTIVITIES

5. MANY MORE ACTIVITIES

10. How would you compare the number of activities that your children take part in since you moved to this address, compared to your former address? Would you say that they now take part in,

1. FAR FEWER ACTIVITIES

2. FEWER ACTIVITIES

3. ABOUT THE SAME NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES

4. MORE ACTIVITIES

5. MANY MORE ACTIVITIES

SECTION C

(Physical Health)

1. Have you been sick in the last month?

YES

NO

2. Has your spouse been sick in the last month?

YES

NO

3. Have any of your children been sick in the last month?
YES NO
4. Have you had to take any kind of medicine prescribed by a doctor in the last month?
YES NO
5. Has your spouse had to take any kind of medicine prescribed by a doctor in the last month?
YES NO
6. Have any of your children had to take any kind of medicine prescribed by a doctor in the last month?
YES NO
7. Have you been unable to carry out normal activities due to illness in the last month? (For example, were unable to do the shopping or to do things you wanted to do.)
YES NO
8. Has your spouse been unable to carry out normal activities due to illness in the last month? (For example, go to work or to do things you wanted to do.)
YES NO
9. Have any of your children been unable to carry out normal activities due to illness in the last month? (For example, were unable to go out and play or to go to school.)
YES NO
10. Have you had to go to see a doctor because you were not feeling well during the last month?
YES NO
11. Has your spouse had to go to see a doctor because he was not feeling well during the last month?
YES NO
12. Have any of your children had to go to see a doctor because they were not feeling well during the last month?
YES NO
13. Have you been in a hospital in the last 6 months?
YES NO

14. Has your spouse been in a hospital in the last 6 months?

YES

NO

15. Have any of your children been in a hospital in the last 6 months?

YES

NO

SECTION D

(Alienation)

Although you may not agree or disagree completely with any of the following statements, please tell me whether you tend more to agree or disagree with each statement.

(Powerlessness)

1. "There is not much that I can do about most of the important problems that we face today."

AGREE

DISAGREE

(Meaninglessness)

2. "Things have become so complicated in the world today that I really don't understand just what is going on."

AGREE

DISAGREE

(Normlessness)

3. "In order to get ahead in the world today, you are almost forced to do some things which are not right."

AGREE

DISAGREE

(Cultural Estrangement)

4. "I am not much interested in the T.V. programs, movies, or magazines that most people seem to like."

AGREE

DISAGREE

(Social Isolation)

5. "I often feel lonely."

AGREE

DISAGREE

(Estrangement from Work)

6. "I don't really enjoy most of the work that I do but I feel that it simply must be done."

AGREE

DISAGREE

SECTION E

(Stigma)

1. Some people [in Public Housing--receiving Rent Supplements] have said that when they are with friends or other people not [in Public Housing or receiving Rent Supplements] they feel embarrassed or uncomfortable. Others say they don't feel that way at all. How do you feel when you are with people who are not [in Public Housing or receiving Rent Supplements]? Would you say,

1. YOU ARE NEVER EMBARRASSED OR UNCOMFORTABLE
2. SOMETIMES EMBARRASSED OR UNCOMFORTABLE
3. OFTEN EMBARRASSED OR UNCOMFORTABLE
4. ALWAYS EMBARRASSED OR UNCOMFORTABLE

2. In general, how do you think people in this community feel about people like yourself who are [in Public Housing or receiving Rent Supplements]? Would you say they feel,

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. VERY UNDERSTANDING | 4. FAIRLY HOSTILE |
| 2. FAIRLY UNDERSTANDING | 5. VERY HOSTILE |
| 3. INDIFFERENT | |

3. Have you had any difficulties or problems with people or businesses in the community that you think happened because you are [in Public Housing or receiving Rent Supplements]?

YES NO

4. Has your spouse had any difficulties or problems with people or businesses in the community that you think happened because you are [in Public Housing or receiving Rent Supplements]?

YES NO

(Stigma of Children, Item 5)

5. Have your children had any difficulties or problems with people or businesses in the community that you think happened because you are [in Public Housing or receiving Rent Supplements]?

YES NO

SECTION F

(Delinquency)

1. Have any of your children been in trouble with the police in the last year?

YES NO

2. Have any of your children had to appear in Juvenile Court in the last year?
- YES NO
3. Have you been contacted by the school in the last year because of the poor behaviour of one of your children?
- YES NO

SECTION G

(Psychological Well-Being)

1. Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days? Would you say you are,
- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. VERY UNHAPPY | 5. SOMEWHAT HAPPY |
| 2. UNHAPPY | 6. HAPPY |
| 3. SOMEWHAT UNHAPPY | 7. VERY HAPPY |
| 4. NEITHER HAPPY NOR UNHAPPY | |
2. Most people worry more or less about some things. Would you say,
- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. YOU NEVER WORRY | 5. SOMETIMES WORRY |
| 2. YOU VERY SELDOM WORRY | 6. OFTEN WORRY |
| 3. YOU SELDOM WORRY | 7. WORRY ALL THE TIME |
| 4. NEUTRAL--HALF AND HALF | |
3. Here is a picture of a ladder. At the bottom of the ladder is the worst life you could possibly have; at the top is the best possible life you could have. Where is your life most of the time? (Please put an x in the box where you feel your life is now most of the time.)

	7 Best Life I Could Possibly Have
	6
	5
	4
	3
	2
	1 Worst Life I Could Possibly Have

4. Here is the same ladder, but this time I want you to show where your life was 5 years ago. (Please put an x where you feel your life was 5 years ago.)

	7	Best Life I Could Possibly Have
	6	
	5	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	Worst Life I Could Possibly Have

5. Here is the same ladder again. This time I want you to show where you feel your life will be 5 years from now. (Please put an x in the box where you feel your life will be 5 years from now.)

	7	Best Life I Could Possibly Have
	6	
	5	
	4	
	3	
	2	
	1	Worst Life I Could Possibly Have

6. During the past month did you feel,

a) Particularly excited or interested in something?

YES

NO

b) Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done?

YES

NO

c) Pleased about having accomplished something?

YES

NO

d) On top of the world?

YES NO

e) That things were going your way?

YES NO

7. During the past month did you ever feel,

a) So restless that you couldn't sit long in a chair?

YES NO

b) Very lonely or remote from other people?

YES NO

c) Bored?

YES NO

d) Depressed or very unhappy?

YES NO

e) Upset because someone criticized you?

YES NO

8. Here are some words and phrases which we would like you to use to describe how you feel about your present life. For example, if you think your present life is very boring, put an x in the box right next to the word "boring." If you think it is very interesting, put an x in the box right next to the word "interesting." If you think it is somewhere in between, put an x where you think it belongs. Put an x in one box on every line.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Boring								Interesting
Enjoyable. . .								Miserable
Easy								Hard
Useless.								Worthwhile
Friendly . . .								Lonely
Full								Empty
Discouraging .								Hopeful
Tied down. . .								Free
Disappointing.								Rewarding
Brings out the best in me								Doesn't give me much chance

(Over-all Satisfaction A)

9. Over all, how satisfied are you with your life?
1. VERY DISSATISFIED
 2. DISSATISFIED
 3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
 4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
 5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
 6. SATISFIED
 7. VERY SATISFIED

SECTION H

(Satisfaction)

I am going to ask you to consider some areas in life that people often consider to be important and I would like you to tell me how satisfied you are with your life in each area.

1. How satisfied are you with the state of your health?
1. VERY DISSATISFIED
 2. DISSATISFIED
 3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
 4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
 5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
 6. SATISFIED
 7. VERY SATISFIED
2. Some single people wish they were married; some married people wish they were single. Some people are satisfied with their marital status; others are not satisfied. How satisfied are you with your marital status?
1. VERY DISSATISFIED
 2. DISSATISFIED
 3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
 4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
 5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
 6. SATISFIED
 7. VERY SATISFIED
3. How satisfied are you with your apartment (or house)?
1. VERY DISSATISFIED
 2. DISSATISFIED
 3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
 4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
 5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
 6. SATISFIED
 7. VERY SATISFIED

4. How satisfied are you with Windsor as a place to live?
1. VERY DISSATISFIED
 2. DISSATISFIED
 3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
 4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
 5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
 6. SATISFIED
 7. VERY SATISFIED
5. How satisfied are you with your daily activities (the things you have to do such as housework, look after the children, work)?
1. VERY DISSATISFIED
 2. DISSATISFIED
 3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
 4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
 5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
 6. SATISFIED
 7. VERY SATISFIED
6. How satisfied are you with your other activities--hobbies, and so on?
1. VERY DISSATISFIED
 2. DISSATISFIED
 3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
 4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
 5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
 6. SATISFIED
 7. VERY SATISFIED
7. How satisfied are you with the religious fulfillment in your life?
1. VERY DISSATISFIED
 2. DISSATISFIED
 3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
 4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
 5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
 6. SATISFIED
 7. VERY SATISFIED
8. How satisfied are you with the churches or other religious groups with which you have had contact?
1. VERY DISSATISFIED
 2. DISSATISFIED
 3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
 4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
 5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
 6. SATISFIED
 7. VERY SATISFIED

9. How satisfied are you with other organizations with which you have contact (such as government departments, housing authorities, welfare departments, courts, schools)?

1. VERY DISSATISFIED
2. DISSATISFIED
3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
6. SATISFIED
7. VERY SATISFIED

10. How satisfied are you with your family life?

1. VERY DISSATISFIED
2. DISSATISFIED
3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
6. SATISFIED
7. VERY SATISFIED

11. How satisfied are you with your friendships?

1. VERY DISSATISFIED
2. DISSATISFIED
3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
6. SATISFIED
7. VERY SATISFIED

12. How satisfied are you with your financial situation (how much income you have)?

1. VERY DISSATISFIED
2. DISSATISFIED
3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
6. SATISFIED
7. VERY SATISFIED

13. How satisfied are you with the way our government runs the country?

1. VERY DISSATISFIED
2. DISSATISFIED
3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
6. SATISFIED
7. VERY SATISFIED

14. How satisfied are you with [Public Housing--Rent Supplements] ?

1. VERY DISSATISFIED
2. DISSATISFIED
3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
6. SATISFIED
7. VERY SATISFIED

(Over-all Satisfaction B)

15. How satisfied are you with your life as a whole?

1. VERY DISSATISFIED
2. DISSATISFIED
3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
6. SATISFIED
7. VERY SATISFIED

SECTION I

(Citizens' Groups)

1. Have you ever been a member of a citizens' group in your area?

YES

NO

2. Do you presently belong to a citizens' group?

YES

NO

3. How often would you say you participated in activities of a citizens' group?

- | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. NEVER PARTICIPATED | 5. OFTEN PARTICIPATED |
| 2. VERY SELDOM PARTICIPATED | 6. VERY OFTEN PARTICIPATED |
| 3. SELDOM PARTICIPATED | 7. ALWAYS PARTICIPATED |
| 4. OCCASIONALLY PARTICIPATED | |

4. How satisfied are you with citizens' groups?

1. VERY DISSATISFIED
2. DISSATISFIED
3. SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
4. MIXED--ABOUT EQUALLY SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED
5. SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
6. SATISFIED
7. VERY SATISFIED

APPENDIX B.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR
Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4
Telephone Area Code 519
253-4232
School of Social Work
July 17, 1979

Dear Madam:

I am doing research through the School of Social Work at the University of Windsor and in cooperation with Social Planning of United Way. The data will be used for a Master's Thesis. I would greatly appreciate your assistance.

The research will study people who live in various housing programs to see how satisfied they feel about a number of important areas.

The information will be collected by interviews conducted by social workers. Their interviews will be arranged at a convenient time in the home of participants. The time required will be about 30 minutes. I would very much like to hear your views.

Both the School of Social Work and Social Planning wish to assure you that your identity and opinions will not be revealed to anyone, nor will any reader of the research be able to identify any persons.

The information that you give, however, will be very important for our research. We hope it will be used to improve present programs.

In the near future, you will be contacted for an interview; we would deeply appreciate your cooperation.

The following persons are aware of the study and have offered their cooperation.

Mrs. Donna Gamble, President, Citizens' Group Council. She may be contacted at the Downtown Community Citizens' Organization Action Centre.

Dr. John Barnes, Acting Director, School of Social Work, University of Windsor.

Mr. Gary McCarthy, Executive Director, United Way of Windsor-Essex County.

Your help is very necessary for our study. It will enable us to write a report that may be of benefit to those who make policy decisions on housing, as well as students interested in housing problems.

Should you be interested in this report, a copy will be placed in the University of Windsor Library in September.

I sincerely thank you.

Yours truly,

J. Patrick Donahoe

APPENDIX C.

The researcher wishes to add this appendix so as to provide additional data and to offer further information regarding the methodology used in this study.

It should be recalled at this point that the purpose of the study was to determine whether or not differences exist in the quality of life of tenants in a Rent Supplement program and tenants in a Public Housing program.

To answer this question it was necessary to have two groups identical in certain key respects except that one group would consist only of tenants in Public Housing and the other group would consist only of tenants in a Rent Supplement program. Then any differences detected in the groups by use of the questionnaire might reasonably be attributed to differences in the housing program. As was noted on page 81 there was no statistically significant difference between subjects in the two groups in the variables: marital status, age, sex, number of children, type of previous accommodation, time at present address, education and source or amount of income. The only statistically significant difference between the groups was that one consisted of tenants in Public Housing and the other consisted of tenants in a Rent Supplement program.

For practical purposes and in consideration of the exigencies of time it was decided that a reasonable expectation would be to complete from 40 to 50 interviews in the time allotted for the study.

It was anticipated that a number of the persons approached by the researcher would not for various reasons complete the interview. As assurance that a minimum of 40 interviews be completed, letters were actually sent to 120 persons in all, 60 in the Rent Supplement program and 60 in Public Housing. A total of 46 interviews were completed, 22 with tenants in Rent Supplement and 24 in Public Housing. Thus of the 120 approached for an interview 74 for various reasons did not complete an interview. Of these 74, 20 refused to be interviewed, 36 could not be contacted after two attempts by the interviewers, 14 could not be reached due to a change of address and four could not complete the interview due to illness.

The total list of tenants in Rent Supplement contained 72 families and 170 seniors. Interviews were completed with only 22 of the total 242 Rent Supplement tenants. Thus the sample was nine percent of the total population. In the Public Housing group only 24 interviews were completed from the total population of 1,453 units. In this case the sample was only two percent of the total population. This would raise serious questions as to the representativeness of the Public Housing sample to the total population. In order to obtain a sample to total

population ratio in Public Housing comparable to that of the Rent Supplement group, a total of 131 interviews would have been required. This number was not possible given the time limitation of this study. The decision was made to have a comparable number from each of the two programs even though this would diminish the sample size of Public Housing sample in proportion to total Public Housing population.

As was noted in Chapter VIII a training session was held for the interviewers. During this session the interviewers were given information on the purpose and overall design of the research project. They were shown a copy of the letter which had been sent to all subjects. (See Appendix B.)

The questionnaire was read and explained in detail. The interviewers were encouraged to use their discretion in the use of probing but to make sure that each question was completed accurately on the questionnaire.

A list of subjects was given to each interviewer which contained an equal number of tenants from each of the Rent Supplement and the Public Housing programs. Two attempts were to be made to contact each person on the list. If contact could not be made after two attempts the interviewer was to go on to the next person on the list.

A T. test for interviewers showed no significant differences in results on any of the items on the questionnaire. Thus differences in the findings could not be attributed to characteristics of the interviewers.

In conclusion, the researcher wishes to supplement the data given in Tables 2 and 3 on pages 82 and 83 respectively. It will be noted that only averages are given for the variable "age." To provide more data regarding the age of respondents the following supplementary table is given.

AGE OF RESPONDENTS			
Total Population N = 46			
Public Housing N = 24		Rent Supplement N = 22	
Age	Number of Tenants	Age	Number of Tenants
23	1	21	1
26	3	24	1
27	1	27	1
29	1	29	1
30	1	34	1
32	1	42	1
34	1	50	1
38	1	58	1
41	1	62	2
42	1	63	1
43	1	64	2
44	1	65	1
46	1	66	1
48	1	67	1
49	1	68	1
67	1	69	1
80	1	72	2
81	1	79	1
83	1	80	1
84	1		22
85	1		
96	1		
	24		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Aaron, Henry J. Shelter and Subsidies: Who Benefits from Federal Housing Policies? Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1972.
- Andrews, Frank. Social Indicators of Well-Being. New York: Plenum Press, 1976.
- Bauer, Raymond A. Social Indicators. Ed. Raymond A. Bauer. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1966.
- Biderman, Albert D. "Social Indicators and Goals." Social Indicators. Ed. Raymond A. Bauer. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1966.
- Burns, Dan. "Housing Policy." Canadian Social Policy. Ed. Shankar A. Yelaja. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978.
- Campbell, Angus, and Converse, Philip. The Quality of American Life. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.
- Cantril, Albert H., and Roll, Charles W. Hopes and Fears of the American People. New York: University Books, 1971.
- Davies, Richard. Housing Reform During the Truman Administration. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1966.
- Dennis, Michael, and Fish, Susan. Programs in Search of a Policy: Low Income Housing in Canada. Toronto: Hakkert, 1972.
- Feagin, Joe R.; Tilly, Charles; and Williams, Constance W. Subsidizing the Poor: A Boston Housing Experiment. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1972.
- Fisher, R. A., and Yates, F. Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural and Medical Research. New York: Hafner Publishing Company, Inc., 1963.
- Fisher, Robert Moore. Twenty Years of Public Housing. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Friedman, Lawrence M. Government and Slum Housing: A Century of Frustration. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1968.

Fuerst, J. S. "Public Housing in the United States." Public Housing in Europe and America. Ed. J. S. Fuerst. London: Croom Helm Ltd., 1974.

Goffman, Erving. Stigma Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Handler, Joel F., and Hollingsworth, Ellen Jane. The Deserving Poor: A Study of Welfare Administration. Institute for Research on Poverty Monograph. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1971.

Hartman, Chester H. Housing and Social Policy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Isler, Morton L. Thinking About Housing: A Policy Research Agenda. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1975.

Jones, M. A. Housing and Poverty in Australia. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1972.

Karn, Valerie A. Stevenage Housing Survey: A Study of Housing in a New Town. Birmingham: Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham, 1970.

Knox, Paul L. Social Priorities for Social Indicators: A Survey Approach. Dundee, Scotland: University of Dundee, 1970.

Lubone, Ray. The Progressives and the Slums. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1962.

Mandelker, Daniel R. "Brooke Amendment." Housing Subsidies in the United States and England. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1973.

Merwin, Donna J. Social Indicators and Societal Monitoring: An Annotated Bibliography. Ed. Leslie D. Wilcox. Washington: Jussey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Michelson, William H. Man and His Urban Environment: A Sociological Approach. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.

Newmark, Norma L., and Thompson, Patricia J. Self, Space and Shelter: An Introduction to Housing. San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1977.

Rainwater, Lee. Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a Federal Slum. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Reeves, Marilyn Langford. Philadelphia Rent Subsidy Program: A Local Approach Using Private Market Housing. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1969.

Rose, Albert, Dr. Canadian Housing Policies. Canadian Conference on Housing, Background Paper No. 2, Toronto, June 1968.

_____. Regent Park: A Study in Slum Clearance. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Smith, Lawrence B. Anatomy of a Crisis: Canadian Housing Policy in the Seventies. Vancouver: Fraser Institute, 1977.

Steiner, Gilbert Y. The State of Welfare. Washington: The Brookings Institute, 1971.

Sternlieb, George S., and Indik, Bernard P. The Ecology of Welfare: Housing and the Welfare Crisis in New York City. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1973.

Wilner, Daniel M.; Price Walkley, Rosabelle; and Pinkerton, Thomas C. The Housing Environment and Family Life: A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Housing on Morbidity and Mental Health. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1962.

Wohl, Anthony S. The Eternal Slum. London: Edward Arnold, 1977.

Journals and Periodicals

Adler, Hans. "Social Indicators Seminar." Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, January, 1972.

Amick, Daniel J., and Kviz, Frederick J. "Density, Building Type and Social Integration in Public Housing Projects." Man--Environment Systems. (May 1974): 187-190.

Angrist, Shirley S. "Dimensions of Well-Being in Public Housing Families." Environment and Behaviour 6(4) (December 1974): 495-516.

- _____. "Social Research on Housing in the United States: Direction and Themes." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare 3(2) (November 1972): 117-124.
- Barrett, Larry D. "Achievement Values and Anomie Among Women in a Low-Income Housing Project." Social Forces 49 (September 1970): 127-134.
- Bell, Wendell. "Anomie, Social Isolation and the Class Structure." Sociometry 20 (June 1957): 105-116.
- Buttel, Frederick, et al. "Ideology and Social Indicators of the Quality of Life." Social Indicators Research, July, 1977, p. 353.
- Christian, David E. "International Social Indicators: The O.E.C.D. Experience." Social Indicators Research, May, 1974, p. 169.
- Dasso, Jerome. "An Evaluation of Rent Supplements." Land Economics 44(4) (November 1968): 441-449.
- Dean, Dwight G. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement." American Sociological Review 26 (October 1961): 753-758.
- Dodder, Richard A. "A Factor Analysis of Dean's Alienation Scale." Social Forces 48(2) (December 1969): 252-255.
- Edgley, Charles K.; Steglich, W. G.; and Cartwright, Walter J. "Rent Subsidy and Housing Satisfaction: The Case of Urban Renewal in Lubbock, Texas." The American Journal of Economics and Sociology 27(2) (April 1968): 113-123.
- Fielding, Byron. "How Useful are Rent Supplements in Meeting Low-Income Housing Needs?" Journal of Housing 26(1) (January 1969): 12-17.
- Foster, Robert. "Economic and Quality of Life Factors in Industrial Location Decisions." Social Indicators Research, July, 1977, p. 247.
- Gillis, A. R. "High Rise Housing and Psychological Strain." Journal of Health and Social Behaviour, Vol. 18 (December 1977): 418-431.
- Hill, John G. "Fifty Years of Social Action on the Housing Front." Social Service Review, June 1948, pp. 160-176.
- Holleb, Doris B. "Social Statistics for Social Policy." Planning. Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, eds., 1968.

- Horan, Patrick M., and Austin, Patricia Lee. "The Social Basis of Welfare Stigma." Social Problems 21(5): 648-657.
- Huttman, Elizabeth D. "Factors Leading to Client Degradation in Welfare and Public Housing." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare 1(1) (Fall 1973): 155.
- Katzman, Martin T. "Some Indicators and Urban Public Policy." Planning. Chicago: American Society of Planning Officials, eds., 1968.
- Kriesberg, Louis. "Neighbourhood Setting and the Isolation of Public Housing Tenants." Journal of the American Institute of Planners 34(1) (January 1968): 43-49.
- Ledbetter, William H., Jr. "Public Housing--A Social Experiment Seeks Acceptance." Law and Contemporary Problems 32 (1967): 490-527.
- Levin, Jack, and Taube, Gerald. "Attitudes Toward Public Housing Among Middle-Age Tenants." Sociological Symposium 3 (Fall 1969): 75-76.
- _____. "Bureaucracy and the Socially Handicapped: A Study of Lower-Status Tenants in Public Housing." Sociology and Social Research 54(2) (January 1970): 209-219.
- Meier, Dorothy, and Bell, Wendell. "Anomie and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals." American Sociological Review 24 (April 1959): 189-202.
- Middleton, Russell. "Alienation, Race and Education." American Sociological Review 28 (December 1963): 973-977.
- Mitchell, Robert E. "Misconceptions About Man Made Space in Partial Defence of High Density Housing." The Family Coordinator 23 (January 1974): 51-56.
- Montgomery, James E. "Commentary on Misconceptions About Man Made Space." The Family Coordinator 23 (January 1974): 57-59.
- Montgomery, Roger. Comment on "Fear and the House-As-Haven in the Lower Class," by Lee Rainwater. Journal of the American Institute of Planners 32(1) (January 1966): 31-37.
- Neal, Arthur G., and Rettig, Salomon. "On the Multi-Dimensionality of Alienation." American Sociological Review 32 (February 1967): 54-64.

- Neave, Davis. "Housing of Welfare Recipients in Calgary: It Doesn't Look Like a \$1,000,000 Worth." Canadian Welfare 49(4). (July-August 1973): 9.
- O'Connell, Dorothy. "Tenants View of Stigma in Public Housing." Housing and People 6(2) (1975): 10-12.
- Onibokun, Adepoju G. Research. Environment and Planning 5(4) (1973): 471.
- _____. "Social System Correlates of Residential Satisfaction." Environment and Behaviour 8(3) (September 1976): 323-344.
- Rainwater, Lee. "Fear and the House-As-Haven in the Lower Class." Journal of the American Institute of Planners 32(1) (January 1966): 23-31.
- Rothblatt, Donald N. "Housing and Human Needs." Town Planning Review Quarterly 42(2) (April 1971): 130-144.
- Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review 24 (December 1959): 783-791.
- Simmons, J. L. "Some Inter-correlations Among Alienation Measures." Social Forces 44 (March 1966): 370-371.
- Spanier, Graham B., and Fishel, Carol. "The Housing Project and Familial Functions: Consequences for Low Income, Urban Families." The Family Coordinator 22(2) (April 1973): 235-240.
- Srole, Leo. "A Measure of Anomie." American Sociological Review 21 (December 1956): 712-713.
- Stoddard, Ellwyn R. "The Adjustment of Mexican American Barrio Families to Forced Housing Relocation." Social Science Quarterly 53(4) (March 1973): 749-759.
- Taube, Gerald, and Levin, Jack. "Public Housing as Neighbourhood: The Effect of Local and Non-Local Participation." Social Science Quarterly 53(3) (December 1971): 534.
- Williams, J. Allen, Jr. "The Multi-Family Housing Solution and Housing Type Preferences." Social Science Quarterly 52(3) (December 1971): 543-559.

Government Documents

Canada. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Data and Systems. Canadian Housing Statistics, 1978. Table 62. Ottawa, March 1979, p. 55.

Canada. Central Mortgage and Housing. Housing in Canada, 1940-1970. Ottawa, 1970.

Canada. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Public Housing in Canada: Research in Urban Renewal and Low-Income Housing, by Adepoju G. Onibokun. Ed. Nancy E. Davies. Ottawa, 1972, Vol. 8, No. 3, p. 2.

Canada. Ministry of State for Urban Affairs. Housing and the Poor, by I. R. Silver. Working Paper A71.2. Ottawa, 1971, p. 21.

Canada. Statutes. Dominion Housing Act, 1935. 25-26, Parts 1-11, George V, Chapter 58, p. 353.

Canada. Statutes. National Housing Act, 1930. 2, Parts 1-11, George VI, Chapter 49, p. 353.

Montreal, P.Q. Joint Committee of the Montreal Board of Trade and the City Improvement League. A Report on Housing and Slum Clearance for Montreal, 1935.

Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services, Research and Planning Branch. Family Benefits Mothers in Metropolitan Toronto. Jean M. James. Research Report No. 2, March 1973, pp. 75-79.

Ontario. Ministry of Housing. Annual Report, 1977/78. p. 27.

Ontario. Ministry of Housing, Community Renewal Branch. Community Improvement Resource Kit. J. F. Brown, Director. Toronto, Ontario, July 1977, Section IV, D, pp. 1, 2 and 21.

Report of the Federal Task Force on Housing and Urban Development. Paul T. Hellyer, Chairman. Ottawa, Canada: Queen's Printer, 1969.

United States. Congress. The Congressional Weekly Report, 23(27) July 2, 1965, pp. 1-2.

VITA AUCTORIS

J. Patrick Donahoe was born in Moncton, New Brunswick, on April 28, 1938. He graduated from Moncton High School in 1957. In 1963 he graduated from St. Francis Xavier University with a B.Sc. A B.Ed. was obtained from the University of New Brunswick in 1971.

From 1963 to 1969 he was Principal of the Mountain View Consolidated School in Moncton. This period was followed by six years as a Teacher of Literature at Harrison Trimble High School in Moncton.

He entered the School of Social Work at the University of Windsor where a B.S.W. was obtained in May 1978. Permission was granted for entrance to the Graduate School of Social Work at the University of Windsor in September 1978.

The author and his wife Diane presently reside in Chatham, Ontario, where he is employed as a community consultant with the Addiction Research Foundation.